ALLEN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1833 01735 9479

GENEALOGY
929.102
M56MMB
1846,
JAN-APR

THE

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1846.

EDITED BY GEORGE PECK, D. D.

VOLUME XXVIII.

THIRD SERIES, VOLUME VI.

New-York:
PUBLISHED BY LANE & TIPPETT,
FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 200 MULBERRY-STREET.
JAMES COLLORD, PRINTER.
1846.

THE

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1846.

EDITED BY GEORGE PECK, D. D.

VOLUME XXVIII.

THIRD SERIES, VOLUME VI.

THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY CHICAGO

New-York:
PUBLISHED BY LANE & TIPPETT,
FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 200 MULBERRY-STREET.
JAMES COLLORD, PRINTER.
1846.

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER.

Art.		Page
I.	The Reformation the Source of American Liberty	5
II.	Dr. Turner's Essay	24
III.	Miss Barrett's Poems	54
IV.	Reading	68
V.	Modes of teaching Languages	93
VI.	Durbin's Observations in the East	114
VII.	Davies' Sermons	138
VIII.	Critical Notices	147

1. The Student's Bible; 2. Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby's Commentary; 3. Barnes's Notes on Ephesians, &c.; 4. Barnes's Notes on Thessalonians, &c.; 5. Barrow's Works; 6. Whewell's Elements of Morality; 7. Upham's Life of Faith; 8. Philosophy of Mystery; 9. Roman Church and Modern Society; 10. Michelet and Quinet on the Jesuits; 11. Sufferings of Christ; 12. Arnold's Lectures on Modern History; 13. Arnold's Miscellaneous Works; 14. Cooley's Book of Useful Knowledge; 15. Carlyle's Life of Schiller; 16. Notes from over Sea; 17. Encyclopedia of Domestic Economy; 18. Prescott's Miscellanies; 19. American Pulpit; 20. Missionary Memorial; 21. Carey's Dante; 22. Montgomery's Poems; 23. Christian Exertion; New Sunday School Books.

CONTENTS OF APRIL NUMBER.

I.	The Works of Isaac Barrow	165
II.	Revolutions in Europe	179
III.	Republican Tendency of the Bible	202
IV.	Sufferings of Christ	227
V.	Dr. Upham's Works	248
VI.	Dr. Arnold's Works	266
VII.	Natural History of Creation	292
VIII.	Critical Notices	328

1. Sturtevant's Preacher's Manual; 2. Guizot's History of the English Revolution; 3. History of Silk, Cotton, Linen, Wool, &c.; 4. Humboldt's Cosmos; 5. Vinet's Vital Christianity; 6. Life of Julius Cæsar; 7. Resources and Duties of Christian Young Men; 8. D'Aubigne's Reformation; 9. Olin's Travels; 10. Young's Suggestions; 11. Edmonson's Sermons; 12. Spring's Attraction of the Cross; 13. Morse's Cerographic Maps; 14. Pilgrim's Progress; 15. Aids to English Composition; 16. Blair's Sermons; 17. Green's Texan Expedition against Mier; 18. Abercrombie's Essays; 19. Jenkyn on the Atonement; 20. Jenkyn on the Spirit; 21. Sawyer on Baptism; 22. Sawyer's Moral Philosophy; 23. Catechism of Christian Morals.

CONTENTS OF JULY NUMBER.

Art.		Page
I.	Mill's Logic	333
II.	Memoir of Rev. Dr. Proudfit	358
III.	Landscape Gardening	373
IV.	Theory of Atonement	392
V.	Revealed Philosophy	414
VI.	History of Wyoming	434
VII.	Capital Punishment	462
VIII.	Critical Notices	476

1. Walker's Companion for the Afflicted; 2. Glimpses of the Dark Ages; 3. Reid's English Dictionary; 4. Gardner's Farmer's Dictionary; 5. Zumpt's Latin Grammar; 6. Pictorial History of England; 7. Pascal's Thoughts; 8. Mahan's Intellectual Philosophy; 9. Bacon's Lives of the Apostles; 10. Missionary Enterprise; 11. D'Aubigne's Discourses and Essays; 12. Miller's Design of the Church; 13. Puritans and their Principles; 14. Harris's Great Commission; 15. Biographical Remains of George Beecher; 16. Philosophy of Reform; 17. Journey to Ararat; 18. Darwin's Voyage of a Naturalist; 19. Life in Prairie Land; 20. Lovest thou me; Sunday School Books.

CONTENTS OF OCTOBER NUMBER.

I.	Protestantism in Italy	485
II.	British Tourists in the United States	508
III.	Puritanism	534
IV.	Phædon	554
V.	Cromwell's Letters and Speeches	573
VI.	Examination of Edwards on the Will	598
VII.	Vegetable Organization	614
VIII.	Critical Notices	625

1. Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature; 2. Eclogues and Georgics of Virgil; 3. M'Clintock's First Book in Latin; 4. Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon; 5. Loomis's Algebra; 6. Draper's Chemistry; 7. School Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities; 8. Bullions' Greek Reader; 9. Ollendorff's Method of teaching French; 10. Brown's Trees of America; 11. Treatise on Dying and Calico Printing; 12. Pictorial History of England; 13. Winslow's Views of the Atonement; 14. Biblical Legends; 15. Bell's Life of Canning; 16. Expedition to Borneo; 17. Matthias's Manual; 18. French Domestic Cookery; 19. Upham's Religious Maxims; 20. Sacred Meditations; 21. Clarke's Commentary; 22. Clarke's Wesley Family; 23. The Solar System; 24. Jamaica, Enslaved and Free; 25. Martyrs of Bohemia; 26. Sketches of the Waldenses; 27. Memoir of Dr. W. F. Arnold; 28. Example for Young Men; 29. Garden of the Lord; 30. Golden Maxims.

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1846.

EDITED BY GEORGE PECK, D. D.

ART. I.—"*Du Prêtre, De La Femme, De La Famille.*" *Spiritual Direction, and Auricular Confession; their History, Theory, and Consequences.* By M. MICHELET, Assistant Prof. in Faculty of Letters, &c. Phila.: James M. Campbell & Co. 1845.

THE present condition of Popery presents a singular combination of weakness and strength. Weak in the power of inherent and prolonged vitality, it is yet strong, partly in the remaining forms of a once vigorous life, and partly in that sudden and feverish strength which is, perhaps, the last convulsive start of expiring nature. So weak that it requires the aid of Austrian bayonets and English frigates to retain possession of the very seat of its power: it is yet so strong, that this very protection is given as the price of its interposition to restrain Irish turbulence and German independence. Like a huge and creeping parasite, it grew and twined itself around the nations during the long night of the middle ages; and though strong arms have torn away many of its folds, and let in the light of heaven; and though a slow and sure decay is working at its root, yet the gnarled trunk and twisted branches still retain their hold on the various ramifications that have sprung from the yet living roots of the old Roman Empire, with at once the tenacity of life and the rigidity of death. Its political element, the Papacy, as a civil power claiming certain exclusive civil and political rights, has become weak, imbecile, effete; an image of gold with feet of clay: while its spiritual element, Popery, the mystery of iniquity, the huge and fallen archangel of Christianity, still retains its power over the minds and hearts of men. The scarlet-robed queen, though degenerated into a wrinkled and shriveled hag, has still retained the privilege of her order, the terrific power of the curse.

This spiritual element within a few years past has been quickened into an amazing activity and semblance of life. This reviving is seen in the solemn aping of its senseless mummeries in the Puseyism of England and America; in the pertinacious and arrogant assertion of its claims to the control of the French system of education; in the growing exhibitions of its ancient intolerance in France, Switzerland, Austria, and Sardinia; in the infamous outrages upon the feeble Society Islanders; in the vast and increasing revenue of the Propaganda Society; in the steady and persevering effort, not so much to convert the heathen as to undermine and supplant every Protestant mission on the face of the earth; in the secret but powerful agencies at work to cast the first seed into the virgin soil of that great hot-bed of futurity, the Mississippi Valley; and in the demands that are so boldly and insolently made for peculiar privileges in the common-school education of some of the states. These and many other facts indicate a return of unwonted energy into the decaying system of Giant Pope; which wiser heads than that of the dreaming tinker once supposed would ere this have been wrapped in its scarlet winding-sheet and laid in the great mausoleum of the past.

A natural result of this quickened energy of Popery, is a quickened resistance to its imperious and exclusive claims. Accordingly we find that in France the demand of the priests and Jesuits to have the control of the university, or great national system of education, has been met with firm and indignant opposition. The priest has attacked the philosopher, and it is therefore not a matter of wonder that the philosopher should retaliate upon the priest. When the former has left his appropriate sphere and intruded upon the domain of the latter, we cannot be surprised if the man of letters should be provoked even "to carry the war into Africa," and show that these high-swelling words were at the least, *vox et præterea nihil.*

These remarks are necessary to explain one peculiarity of the work before us. Since the French Revolution, such has been the separation between secular and sacred things, that the men devoted to the one, have been almost necessarily presumed to be aloof from the other. Even in those countries where the ministers of religion are officers of the government, and the rulers of the state are in some sense rulers of the church, there has been until recently almost a tacit conventional understanding, that the spheres of temporal and spiritual jurisdiction were totally distinct, and that mutual intrusion was inadmissible. This state of things, however, whether right or wrong, is evidently passing away. Religion is

becoming daily a more active element in the civil and political movements of the world, and of consequence, civilians and politicians are rapidly becoming theologians.

The work of M. Michelet before us is one of the indications of this new era We have here a treatise on polemics by a layman, a philosopher, a professor in the university, and a distinguished historian of France. Nor is this a flippant, shallow satire of the Voltaire school, but the profound historical and logical analysis, and earnest, thrilling appeal of a man who, whatever be his private opinions on the subject of Christianity, has deeply pondered and keenly felt a horrible evil. It forms a part of that controversy which has been waged for some time with no little bitterness between the university and the priesthood of France. Its immediate occasion was some remarks which the author felt impelled to make in the course of his historical lectures in the college of France. These remarks excited the ire of the Jesuits and priests, and led them to attack the distinguished lecturer with great acrimony and virulence, both in public and private. He was assailed from the pulpit and from the press, in the social circle and in the street. Even his own house was not sacred from their insolent intrusion, but was invaded by the pupils of the exasperated ecclesiastics, to drown by vociferation and insulting noise the utterance of the truth they were unwilling to hear and unable to answer. In sheer self-defense, M. Michelet was forced to justify his allegations by an appeal to the public through the press; and the volume before us constitutes a part of this vindication. And well has he performed his task. The folly that could goad and drive a man of his intellectual force and historical attainments to the position of an assailant, in the very face of positive, unrepealed laws on the statute book of France, banishing from her soil the crafty, grasping, and turbulent followers of Loyola, is shown, by the recent resuscitation and virtual enforcement of these laws, and the sudden outburst of indignant feeling against these ecclesiastical Machiavellians, to have been but one of the symptoms of the *prius dementat.*

The object of the work is to develop something of the history, theory, and consequences of spiritual direction and auricular confession in the Romish Church of France. It consists of three parts. The first contains the history of spiritual direction during the seventeenth century. In this the author brings forward, as far as delicacy on the one hand and justice on the other will warrant, the theory of direction then first promulged. He gives a graphic and lively sketch of the Quietists and Mystics of that period, with proofs of the nature and tendency of their doctrines, even on such

hearts as those of a de Chantal and a Guyon, a Fenelon and a Bossuet. Some of the developments of this period are startling, and even horrible. The second part contains an elaborate and ingenious discussion of direction in general, and particularly the form that exists in the nineteenth century. It delineates the resemblances and differences between the church, the confessional, and the confessor of the middle ages, and those of the present day; the tremendous power of the system for evil on the heart of the confessor, on the penitent, and through her on society; the absolute power of the director; the internal condition of convents, and some of the horrible scenes that have been there enacted. He establishes results by the most unanswerable reasoning on the admitted rules that guide the confessor and director, and on undoubted facts that are enough to cause every husband, father, and brother in France to tremble. The description of the web that the priest slowly and gradually weaves first round his victim and then round himself, possesses a dramatic power of analysis and portraiture that thrills the heart alternately with burning indignation, painful compassion, and shuddering horror. The third part imbodies a brief sketch of the family, what it is, and what it ought to be: defining the present, and the proper position of the wife and mother; and contains an earnest appeal for maternal education.

Our object, however, is not to give any extended sketch of this book, so much as to pursue a train of reflection to which it will naturally give rise. We cannot but remember that the same system essentially is existing and operating in our midst; a system which by its own profession is incapable of change, and which, therefore, indorses with its own hand the fair and legitimate developments of its principles elsewhere. And we cannot fail to consider that the same tremendous engine thus applied to social ends, may also be directed to civil and political ends with equal power. It therefore becomes a problem of most absorbing interest, what would be the result of such an application in a political system like our own? The solution of this problem involves a very wide range of discussion, historical, theological, and political, on which we cannot venture to enter within the limits of the present article.

We propose simply to select from among the topics included in this important inquiry, one, owing to its negative form among the least invidious, though not least important in its bearing on the general question, viz., the historical relation of Protestantism to our free institutions. This we will discuss by maintaining the proposition, that the Reformation of the sixteenth century is the source of American liberty. In order that we may have clearly before us

the point of discussion, it may be necessary to explain somewhat the terms of this proposition. It will undoubtedly be admitted by every one, that there is a connection of cause and effect existing between historical events as real as that which is found in any other case. The movements of communities are related to each other as actually as the movements of individuals, for the very reason that they are but the aggregates of individual action. History when written and read as it ought to be is not a confused heap of links, but a chain: not a pile of building materials in which there is contact without connection, but an edifice, vast and glorious, though yet unfinished; with much of the rubbish of the work yet scattered about it, and much of the scaffolding not yet removed: but an edifice which, when it shall be viewed from the elevation of another world, will be found to have its foundations in the depths of chaos and its culminating dome in the heights of eternity: and like the tower of Pharos, whatever name be inscribed on its external coating now, when all that is adventitious is removed, it will be found to have engraved on its very structure the name of the builder and maker, GOD. The philosophy of history and the use of history consist in discovering and explaining this connection of its events, and learning from them the laws of human action. This connection in some cases is nearer, and in others more remote, but in every case really and actually existing.

Now we alledge that such a connection exists between the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and the American Revolution with its happy results, in such a sense that had the former never occurred, the latter would either never have been undertaken, or if undertaken would have been unsuccessful.

We do not assert that the Reformation was the sole or direct cause of this revolution; but simply that it was though a remote yet an important cause, or rather a necessary prerequisite or preliminary movement, without which, or something analogous to it, this revolution could not have been effected. By this, we of course do not mean that nothing but this precise movement could have produced such a result; but only that in point of fact it did do so; and that without some such great regeneration in human society no such result ever could have been attained.

It may be further remarked that we do not regard the Reformation as an isolated fact in history. We sometimes hear facts referred to the Reformation as their cause, simply because they are *post hoc*, without inquiring whether they are also *propter hoc:* facts which in truth are the effects of causes entirely distinct, or of causes blended with it only to a limited extent. The Reformation was

itself a vast effect, produced by the combined action of many causes: causes, some of which traced their source to the fountain that was unsealed on Calvary, or higher still, to that which gushes in its living purity from beneath the eternal throne; and some of which came up from the dark depths of the dark ages, or deeper still, from the lurid caverns of the pit: but causes, all of which tended to this one great result, and mingled their forces in producing it to an extent of which we are now, perhaps, incapable of judging. In turn, this effect became a cause. Soon some of the combined elements became disentangled, and each produced distinct results by its independent operation, but still the great resultant of these forces rolls on: as the ocean continues to heave and swell in its billowy might long after the winds that first aroused its deep tossings have spent their force and been lulled to rest, or have swept onward to rave and rage over mountain, and forest, and field.

The American Revolution, although occurring on this side the Atlantic, was strictly a European event. It was the result of the advance of society and the evolution of free principles in northern Europe. It was occasioned by European acts of oppression. It was achieved by men, many of whom were born on the soil of Europe, and most of whom owed much of their energy to that stern, unquailing Saxon spirit that was bequeathed them by their fathers. It was rendered so speedily successful by European sym pathy and assistance. In one word, had not Europe been what it was, America never would have been what it is. Europe of the fifteenth century, instead of Europe of the eighteenth, would have made the American Revolution another war of the peasants, and its fate a counterpart to that of Poland. Hence, whatever tended materially to modify or shape the state of society in Europe before 1776, exerted at least some influence on that memorable period. Had this infant Hercules come earlier to the birth, he would either have been still-born, or have been destroyed by the serpents sent by Jealousy and Hate to strangle the young giant in his cradle.

In further endeavoring to establish the proposition thus explained, we propose to show that the Reformation, in its character as a mere religious movement, prepared the way and secured the success of this great civil and political revolution: that, as a great movement of the human mind, freeing itself from the trammels of ancient authority, it found one of its earliest and most signal developments in the American struggle for independence: and also, that in its direct influence on the men to whom the success of this work under God is to be referred, it produced those characteristics of mind

and soul, to which that success is instrumentally to be ascribed. If these points are fairly made out, the main proposition may be considered as sufficiently established.

Our first position is, that the Reformation was a revival of the religion of the Bible: that this religion is favorable to liberty; and therefore that its establishment in America, by the legitimate action of the Reformation, tended to secure the liberties that were demanded in the war of the revolution, as well as inspire the feelings by which this demand was prompted.

On the first member of this proposition we need not enlarge; for if any one denies that the Reformation was what the name implies it to have been, an improvement in religion, and a revival of the religion of the Bible in contradistinction to that of tradition and the church, this is not the place to argue the point, even if argument were all that such a mind needed. It is not pretended that the religion of the Reformation was spotless and perfect, but simply that it was a closer approximation to the religion of the Bible. Nor is it even necessary to our purpose, to maintain that this religion of the Bible is the most perfect possible type of religion; but merely that this is the religion of the Reformation. Even a candid Roman Catholic will admit, as F. Schlegel has virtually done, that the Reformation was a nearer resemblance to the religion of the Bible than that which preceded it; he will only alledge that it is defective because the Bible is not the only rule of faith. Nor do we assert that the motives of all the reformers were either pure or purely religious; that no personal or political feelings mingled in their motives: but simply that the great result, after subtracting all attendant evils, has been in favor of the uncorrupted religion of the word of God. This is a position that will be disputed by few, and disproved by none; for "the Bible, the Bible, is the religion of Protestants."

Can there be any serious doubt about the truth of the second branch of this argument, that the religion of the Bible tends to promote genuine and wholesome liberty? Who can read the sermon on the Mount, or some of the Epistles, and not feel that the spirit there breathed is a spirit of freedom and equality? The paltry distinctions of wealth and rank, the haughtiness of power, and the willfulness of tyranny, are alike adverse to its principles and hostile to its success. Its high and commanding declaration is, "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you." This rule is addressed to all, and therefore asserts what is common to all. But it most plainly implies that the rights every man claims *from* another, are the rights every other may claim from him:

which is only true on the manifest assumption that the rights of all (in the relative sense in which the rule alone is applicable) are equal. Thus the golden rule is the very seed from which grew the Declaration of Independence. There is not a ground on which tyranny rests its claims that is not destroyed by the Bible. Trampling upon the silly boast of hereditary nobility and royal blood, it declares that "God has made of one blood all nations of men that dwell on the earth." Sweeping away the tinsel and pasteboard partitions of society, it asserts that, in the presence of the King of kings, "the rich and the poor meet together, and God is the author of them all." The essence of tyranny is the claim of the one or the few over the many: the essence of religion is the equal rights of all. The demand of tyranny is, Submit and believe; the exhortation of religion is, "Examine all things and hold fast that which is good."

But why attempt a proof of this point from general considerations, when we have facts the most clear and undoubted that bring us to the same result? Where do we find free principles now prevalent in the world? Is it in Turkey, once the terror of Europe? in China, with her polished arts and thronging millions? or in the continent that once boasted a Memphis and a Carthage? Is it where Paganism and Islamism have sway, that we find the rights of the many admitted and respected; the wholesome administration of law and justice sustained; and the protection of person, property, and reputation secured? Did not the crescent of the prophet rise in a storm of rapine and blood, culminate in pride and tyranny, and thenceforward gleam coldly down on the prostrate and trampled rights of man? Do not the millions of Paganism prostrate themselves before the crushing car of despotism? Are not liberty and Christianity marked by the same geographical boundaries? Why this clearly-marked outline, if there be no positive and actual influence exerted by the one upon the other? The causes are not solely referable to the different religions, but in the investigation of these causes we will be able to trace so many of them either directly or indirectly to this source, as to warrant us to regard it as the decisive agency. There is a more profound influence at work here than the tricks of statesmanship and the blustering of war: an influence heaven-born and heaven-directed, which, moving in the deep pulsations of the mighty heart of society, gave strength to the strong arm, and light to the clear head, whose results we see thus palpably set forth to our view.

But we have not yet reached the limits of our proposition, which is, that the particular form of religion revived by the Reformation

tains keep watch over the beauty below; and the same old Tiber continues to pour the tide from his mighty urn, as when the tramp of the Roman legions echoed round the world: but the spirit of Rome has departed. Can any one fail to discover the reason of this departure? Look also at Spain. Was she not once a great and powerful nation? Did she not wield the destinies of Europe and infant America? Did not her fleets and argosies cover every sea? At the very period of the Reformation was not her Charles V. at once the Napoleon and the Mohammed of Europe? Yet rejecting the Reformation and striving to crush it, has not the curse of Almighty God seemed to rest upon her? Do we not think of Spain now as we do of one of her strutting hidalgoes, with a longer pedigree than purse; with a sense of dignity and importance in exact proportion to the utter absence of all that could justify and support it; stalking in state abroad and starving in rags at home? Has she not been the victim of alternate anarchy and misrule? Is not Protestant Britain to a great extent free and powerful, while Papal Spain and Portugal are crushed with tyranny, or rent with faction? Is not Protestant Prussia really free, though nominally under an absolute sovereign; while Papal Austria is as despotic in fact as in form? Is not Protestant Saxony free in fact, while Papal Sicily is enslaved? Will not Holland make the same comparison with Belgium, and Switzerland with southern Germany? Is not Edinburgh, with not one half the natural advantages of Florence, immeasurably the superior of the Tuscan metropolis, though once the home of the Medici, and the literary emporium of the world? Can all this be either accidental, or the result of causes distinct from religion?

But can we not see the same facts at our doors? Why has Protestant North America become free and powerful, while Papal South and Central America have become but a scene of anarchy and confusion in a similar attempt? Is it because of a different state of society? But what produced this difference? Is there any point of difference affecting this question, not distinctly traceable to the direct or indirect religious influence to which they were respectively subjected? We know that Popery, when in the ascendant, has always refused to educate or elevate the masses, and breathe into them that noble spirit of self-reliance, or rather God-reliance and truth-reliance, without which free institutions are impossible. It is true De Tocqueville argues the democratic tendency of Popery, from its placing all men on a level before it, and demanding their submission. But he might on the same grounds prove the democratic tendency of death; or show that the Eastern despot, who tramples on all necks but his own, is an apostle of freedom. It is

precisely this demand of a blind subjection to an earthly sovereignty, temporal or spiritual, that makes Popery the unchangeable foe to genuine liberty.

In view of these facts, can any one suppose that there was a single nation, before the time of the Reformation, in which such a revolution as the American could have been effected? And since the Reformation, has there been any government not influenced by its principles, in which such a step could successfully have been taken? If not, we are led inevitably to the conclusion that unless the American colonies had possessed the very religion they did, to give form to their characters and habits; and unless the great powers of Europe had been under the same influences, we might infer a very different issue to the struggle. Either combination would have prevented victory, or victory ended in anarchy. We are therefore from these considerations at liberty to conclude, that the Reformation, regarded simply as a religious movement, was a necessary prerequisite to the American Revolution, and was so closely connected with it as, in a modified but still accurate and important sense, to be called the source of American liberty.

Our next position is, that the Reformation, as a great movement of the human mind to throw off the trammels of ancient prescriptive authority, found its earliest and fullest political development in the American Revolution.

No one, who is at all acquainted with the history of the Reformation, can consider it as simply a religious movement. It was so, perhaps, to a great extent in the minds of Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin, when it first arose: but it did not and could not long remain unmixed with other elements. It was not merely a revolution in the church, but also in the state; and indeed in the very mind and feelings of society. It was a great uprising of the human mind against authority, and a struggle for liberty of thought, speech, and action. Indeed, it was impossible that it could be otherwise, from the very nature of the system it was designed to throw off. Popery was not merely a form of religion, but a vast politico-religious system, which claimed supremacy over all human governments; asserting its right to create and depose kings; to divide and allot kingdoms, and even to dispose of the undiscovered regions of the earth, according to the sovereign will of the successor of St. Peter, and the secret decrees of the Vatican. This political power had for centuries been great and absolute, and claiming as it did to come from God, and to be exercised according to his infallible guidance, its influence for weal or for wo was tremendous. Nor were its claims merely civil or political. It claimed an authority

and assumed a jurisdiction more deep and wide than that asserted by any government on earth. Asserting as it did a constant and infallible guidance by the Spirit of God, and professing to be his vicegerent on the earth, it extended its authority to the very soul, and under the awful penalty of eternal retributions demanded the submission of thought itself to the decrees of popes and councils. Hence science was regarded as inimical to this absolute fettering of thought, and Galileo was permitted to review his astronomy in the prison of the Inquisition, for presuming to know what the church had not taught. The Romish theologians of Paris solemnly decreed "that religion was undone if the study of Greek and Hebrew was permitted." A fair specimen, perhaps, of the spirit of the Papacy at this time, in reference to these pursuits, may be conveyed in an extract from a book published by Conrad de Heresbach, a grave and respectable writer of this period. Speaking of this point, he says, "A new language has been invented which is called Greek: guard carefully against it; it is the mother of every species of heresy. I observe in the hands of a great many people a book written in this language, which they call the New Testament: it is a book full of thorns and vipers. With respect to Hebrew, it is certain, my dear brethren, that all who learn it, are instantly converted to Judaism." This was the prevailing spirit of the Papacy before, and even at the time of, the Reformation. It is true Leo X. and some of the cardinals were patrons of literature and the arts; but they by no means represented the spirit of the church, and even they began soon to suspect that they had committed an error in giving any countenance to this partial development of a form of science, which, cherishing as it did an enthusiasm for antiquity, was one of the forms least dangerous to the church. Popery thus ranked herself against the rising spirit of inquiry and thirst for knowledge that had begun to move throughout Europe. This was to her a most fatal error. There was a current setting strongly toward the emancipation of thought that could not be successfully resisted. The dispersion of so many Hellenists as were scattered through Europe by the fall of Constantinople; the consequent revival of classical studies; the discovery of printing; the improvements in painting and engraving; the changes in the relations of nations produced by the discovery of America and the southern passage to India; the introduction of gunpowder into war, and the compass into navigation, produced a swelling of the tide of thought to wider expansion, that would have shivered and swept away in its onward flow broader and mightier barriers than the decayed and enfeebled embankments of the Papacy. As it, however,

attempted to restrain and curb the proud waves of this swelling torrent, the Reformation became *ipso facto* the channel in which flowed this enlargement of mind, and thus assumed its mixed character. It became thus, by this position of Popery, a revolt of the awakened mind of Europe against absolute authority in matters of thought, civil and religious, and an assertion of the liberty in both secured by the Bible.

That this movement tended toward liberty, cannot for an instant be doubted. How could it be otherwise? The instinctive logic of the mind was, if the tyranny of priests be wrong, why not that of kings? If it be intolerable in religion, why not in politics? Was it wrong in the greater, and right in the less? Indeed, the mere withdrawal of the coercive jurisdiction of ecclesiastics was itself a great advance toward liberty. It was the removal of one species of authority, and the substitution of nothing in its stead.

There was another and more important advance made in popular emancipation. In the attempt to overthrow the external symbols of the Romish worship, the people began to feel their might and appreciate its value. The *tiers etat*, in time to become so terrible to tyrants, began to feel the pillars of their prison house and test their strength. Before, like a giant charmed and fettered by a spell or a talisman, they had meekly bowed to the will of their masters: but now, like that giant, when it became manifest that he had been mocked and chained by words, they turned in fury on their oppressors. Hence, in the war of the peasants in Germany, their demand was first, freedom from the tyranny of priests; and next, freedom from the oppression of their feudal lords.

Indeed, the Reformation was forced in self-defense to assert the right of free inquiry, liberty of speech, and popular freedom. It had no sooner arisen than it met with persecution. In order to show the injustice of this persecution and defend their opinions, liberty of thought, speech, and action, were indispensable to the reformers; and hence, strongly asserted and maintained. The first books written against the absolute power of governments were written by Protestants. The Puritans of England, the Huguenots of France, and the Dutch and German reformers, were the bold advocates of the rights of the people. To this ground they were forced in sheer self-defense by their persecutors. Whatever be the reason of the fact, it still remains true, that the reformers promulged the great truths of freedom and popular rights, and to them are to be traced the results of these truths as we find them speedily beginning to be developed. It is true, like a powerful medicine, the first effects on the body politic were violent and exhausting, as we

see in the thirty years' war, the war of the Swabian peasants, the excesses of the Anabaptists of Germany, and of the Fifth Monarchy men of England. But these eruptions and spasms are to be charged rather on the morbid humors of the diseased and corrupted system, than on the remedies applied for its cure.

But although the immediate effects of this resurrection of the mind of the world may have been apparently evil, its ultimate effects were not only good, but they tended by a necessary progression to prepare the way and secure the success of the American Revolution. The treaty of Westphalia, which is the charter of the liberties of modern Europe, was the direct result of the Reformation. Then followed the check on the grasping ambition of Austria; the rise of liberal views and extension of rights in France, under Henry of Navarre; the firm establishment of the Helvetian republics; and the two revolutions in England by which the rights of the people were so much extended: all of which were not only the results of the Reformation, but the establishment of principles which were essential to the success of the American struggle. If to this we add the great awakening of mind effected by it, in which every department of thought produced its giants, national jurisprudence became a science, and popular rights an acknowledged entity, the point in question will be still more firmly established. The latter part of the sixteenth and the seventeenth century produced more men of gigantic girth and stature in every province of intellect, more discoveries of importance to the human race, and established in northern Europe more great ideas and principles concerning popular rights, than any period of time since the creation of the world. The spirit of enterprise thus created in England produced the establishment of British power in India; and this exerted, perhaps, a more direct influence on the success of our revolutionary struggle, than men commonly suppose. Laying aside all national prejudice, it might perhaps be difficult for an intelligent mind to show, that if British relations in India had been different in the latter part of the eighteenth century; if her hold there had been less precarious, and the hopes of France to obtain this glittering prize less sanguine, the revolutionary struggle might not have been more serious, at least, if not less successful.

It may, perhaps, be difficult for us to estimate the precise obligation of the American Revolution to this general awakening of mind produced by the Reformation: but can any one doubt the fact? Would such a revolution have been dreamed of before the Reformation? Would it have been projected since in any country that had not shared in this resurrection of mind? Would it have been

attempted, even by Englishmen, before the two great revolutions of the middle and end of the seventeenth century, in which so many popular rights were established? and were not these revolutions the direct result of the Reformation? Or if attempted, is not its fate illustrated in that of France, which, maddened by the cruel abuses of Popery, confounded it with Christianity, and in rejecting the impiety of men, renounced all piety to God; and not content with retaliating the cruelties of the revocation of the edict of Nantes and St. Bartholomew's eve, having once tasted blood, like an infuriated tiger continued to gorge its horrid appetite until, wearied with its bloody banquet, it sought refuge and quiet in the very cage and fetters from which it had escaped? Or would it not have been a parallel to the fate of the South American revolutions, which, attempting to apply the principles of the age to those who were behind its spirit, have shown that there is a deeper spring of political prosperity than the strife of war or the shifts of statesmanship are able to reach?

In the nature of things it was necessary that this general outbursting of thought and feeling, caused by the Reformation, should have ultimately a channel in which to discharge its waters. Such a channel was the American Revolution. There was none previously that can be fairly regarded as the receptacle of these fountains. The only events that can at all claim to be so regarded, are the revolution which beheaded the first Charles, and that which dethroned the second James. These movements, although memorable and important, were yet not full developments of this free spirit of the Reformation; for many lingering remnants of ancient tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, remained, some of which are not yet extinct. As there was no other event in the world earlier than the American Revolution that can lay any claim to be considered a development of these new and important principles; and as in the nature of things some such development was as necessary as a channel to a fountain, and as the American Revolution did rest on precisely the principles asserted by the Reformation, we are necessarily led to regard it as that development. This great event gathering in its mighty tide the mingled waters unsealed by the hands of Luther, Calvin, and Knox, swept onward like our own father of waters; at first struggling with opposing difficulties, but soon swelling and widening in the majesty of its resistless might until it became the outlet for half a world. Hence, in the same sense in which we assert Christianity to be the source of many of the elements of modern civilization, or any one great historical event the cause of another in which it found its natural development,

may we assert that the Reformation is the source of American liberty.

The last point to be discussed, which must be treated with more brevity than it deserves, considering its intrinsic importance and its value in the argument, is, that the American Revolution is under great obligation to the Reformation, owing to the direct influence exerted by that event, or its legitimate consequences, on the minds and souls, the habits and feelings, the principles and maxims, of those who were the chief actors in that vast and glorious achievement.

It is an interesting fact in our early history, that the first colony ever planted in North America was planted by the direct influence of the Reformation. Half a century before the landing of the Pilgrims, and a quarter of a century before Raleigh attempted to colonize Virginia, a colony was planted through the energy of the brave and devoted but unfortunate Coligny, who afterward perished in the massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve. In May, 1562, a colony was founded at Port Royal Inlet, now embraced by the county of Beaufort, S. C., and a fort built which was called Carolina, in honor of Charles IX., the subsequent murderer of so many thousand brave and unsuspecting Protestants. The object of this colony was to give a place of refuge to the persecuted Huguenots, who, from the time that Francis I. opposed the Reformation because he thought it destructive to monarchy, had been the objects of dislike and ill-disguised persecution. The object of its noble founder was to establish a vast French Protestant empire in the new world, which should fully imbody the great ideas of the Reformation. Had not this plan been frustrated by the frenzy and cruelty of Popery in the assassination of Henry IV., the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the bloody massacre of St. Bartholomew's eve, and their subsequent results, the project would probably have been successful; and America, instead of being an offspring of England, would have been a child of ancient and chivalrous France, to whose warm and generous impulses it has always had more affinity of feeling, than to the cold reserve and stately pride of the haughty and self-styled mistress of the ocean. And we may remark in passing, that it can be shown with undoubted clearness, that but for these same causes, by which the Reformation was so nearly crushed in France, the French Revolution in its bloody form would most likely never have occurred; the structure and character of the French government would have been entirely different, and the destinies of the world would not have been written in blood and hell-fire as we now see them recorded. These speculations, however, we forbear.

But although this effort was frustrated by the blind and bloody zeal of the Jesuits of France and Spain, we know that afterward, when France, by the revocation of the edict of Nantes, not only murdered thousands of her Protestant children, but drove more than five hundred thousand of her best and bravest subjects to seek beyond her limits an asylum of freedom to worship God, the new world became a place of refuge for the persecuted of the old. The children of the Huguenots in the struggle of the revolution retained their ancestral love of freedom; and in the halls of congress, and on some of the hotly-contested fields of the south, left the same testimony of the Protestant spirit of antagonism to tyranny, that yet speaks in the blood of their martyred fathers from the vine-clad hills of sunny and beautiful France. Thus the Huguenot spirit, which was in part the imbodied spirit of the Reformation, a spirit of high and ardent longing after freedom of thought, of speech, and of action, untrammeled by priestcraft or kingcraft, engrafted on a national and hereditary jealousy of England, produced in its influence on many of the colonists that indomitable love of liberty, and that steady resistance to the encroachments of British oppression, that were the animating spirit of the revolution.

But when we think of the men who gave character to the revolutionary struggle, we instinctively turn to the land of the Pilgrims, and on Plymouth Rock we see the fire kindled that proved the beacon of the world. Had New-England not been what she was, old England would not have been what she is;—the rival instead of the mistress of America. The spirit of the revolution first appeared there, because it had been there planted by the men who forsook home and fatherland for "freedom to worship God." Its first imbodied organizations were there formed, for there had England first sown the dragon's teeth that were to spring up armed men. The first victims that bled on its green altar were the children of the Pilgrims. The first giant blow that sundered the bonds uniting the old world and the new, was struck on the soil that enshrined the hallowed dust of the Pilgrim fathers.

It is a curious fact, perhaps sufficiently authenticated, that in consequence of the civil and ecclesiastical oppression of Charles I., that monarch "who never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one," while the same persecuting spirit was still rife that drove the Pilgrim fathers in 1620 to seek a grave in the wilderness, rather than a home in oppression, Oliver Cromwell and the immortal Hampden, in 1637, were actually on board a vessel in the Thames bound to New-England. The vessel was prohibited from sailing by an order of council, and Cromwell and Hampden ordered back,

soon to put the heel on that government that had thus placed an interdict on them.

Whether this be true or not, there was yet many a "village Hampden," and many a Cromwell, "guiltless of his country's blood," in that noble band of emigrants, and they left their own high and free spirit as their most priceless legacy to their children.

There is no one, who knows anything of the history of this period, that knows not, that the Puritan was at once the child of the Reformation and the child of liberty. From the persecutions of the infamous house of the Stuarts, whose maxim was, "No bishop, no king;" and from the free air of Genevan liberty and republicanism, they imbibed on the one hand a hatred of tyranny, and on the other a love of freedom. It is true there are those who make themselves merry at the expense of the Roundhead: and the whine, the cant, and the oddities of these men are all that they can see worthy of their notice. But they who do not look at men with the eyes of a dancing-master or a fop, can see in the Puritan some of the noblest lines of the human character. Wherever we see him, we find the same great traits of lofty purpose, unshaken faith, patient reliance on the truth, and undying love of liberty. John Hampden, that pure and lofty spirit who combined the tongue of a Henry with the heart of a Washington, was a Puritan. John Milton, that man of fire, whose love of liberty was a consuming passion, and who would have been the greatest patriot and the greatest statesman of his age, if he had not been the greatest poet, was a Puritan. The men who enacted the most important parts in the two great revolutions of England, and by whose treasure and blood their most valuable results were secured, were Puritans. The Puritan imbodied the soul of the Reformation, and bequeathed it to his descendants, who in the Hancocks, the Adamses, the Otises, the Warrens, and the Franklins of the revolution were worthy of the lofty and unflinching spirit of their fathers.

Nor were these the only elements mingling in this mighty production of the advancing history of the world. "God sifted three nations for seed to sow this virgin soil." There mingled with the conscript fathers of the republic, who traced their ancestry to the Huguenot and the Puritan, the children of the men who on the level plains of Holland wrested from the bigoted Philip the heritage of the Reformation. The descendants of these men inherited this glorious patrimony, and asserted it at Saratoga, White Plains, Monmouth, and Princeton.

Thus, in the Huguenots of the south, the Puritans of New-England, and the republican emigrants of the United Provinces in the

middle states and New-York, all of them men cradled in the principles of the Reformation, and men who gave the tone to American liberty, we have the direct influence of the Reformation in producing, shaping, and consummating the struggle for the freedom of our fathers.

Nor was the coincidence of such training and such a part in the drama of the world's history merely accidental. These were men whom it is not hazarding too much to assert, that Popery, in her unmingled influence on a people, never could have produced. If she could, where are they? Has not a thousand years been long enough to bring them forth? Why then have they not appeared? Why have they been only the children of the Reformation? Is it not because the Reformation alone was capable of generating such men? What were the traits of character required by the revolution? Were they not precisely that boldness, firmness, and independence of spirit produced by the Reformation? From the very nature of the movements, were not the attributes of mind required for each, identical? Are not the men who achieved both, remarkably similar in character? And do we find such men coming forth as the legitimate offspring of Popery? Why is it thus on any other ground than the hypothesis defended in this discussion? But whether Popery could produce such men or not is an immaterial point in this argument: is it not true that in point of fact, the Reformation in its legitimate results did produce and mold the very men who achieved the revolutionary struggle? If so, this is all that we need for the establishment of this branch of our proposition.

We have thus shown, if we mistake not, that the Reformation, being a revival of the free religious spirit of the New Testament, tended at least to pave the way for the assertion and maintenance of the doctrines of the revolution, and being securely planted on the soil of America, inspired the love of liberty and prompted its demands; that, as a great movement of the human mind in Europe, endeavoring to free itself from the trammels of prescriptive authority, it found its first and fullest legitimate development in the birth of the American nation; and also, that in its direct influence on the mere individuality and personal character of those engaged in this struggle, it produced the men qualified for the crisis.

Combining these considerations, we are at liberty to conclude that the Reformation was in the sense before explained the source of American liberty.

This discussion is not one of barren, useless speculation. There are causes now at work in our midst that go to show that we are

not done with the struggle of 1520. Let this land become deeply imbued with the pure and plastic spirit, with the piety, the morality, and the free soul of the Reformation, and the hallowed structure of our liberties, erected in such troublous times, may bless the eyes and gladden the hearts of future generations. But let the contrary be the case, and the star that rose like that of Bethlehem, to lead the weary wanderer westward to a glorious destiny, shall set in darkness and blood, the last hope of a wretched and down-trodden world.

ART. II.—*Essay on our Lord's Discourse at Capernaum, recorded in the Sixth Chapter of St. John.* By SAMUEL H. TURNER, D. D., Professor of Biblical Learning and Interpretation of Scripture in the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and of the Hebrew Language and Literature in Columbia College, New-York. Harper & Brothers, 82 Cliff-street, N. Y. 1845.

THE popular mind of this country, though commonly considered enlightened, is certainly not a very reflective mind. We read much; but do we think much? Newsprints, pamphlets, books, and publications of every imaginable sort, are continually passing through our hands. But do we stop to deliberate over their contents? Does not the incessancy with which we have to keep swallowing down this endless variety of intellectual food, necessarily forbid any wholesome digestion of it? Then, again, our pursuits and our habits as a people rather indispose us to silent, accurate reflection. The very activity of which we boast is fatal to critical inquiries of a speculative nature; for it is chiefly a mechanical, out-door activity. We rise from our beds in the morning—perhaps catch up our Bibles, and read a chapter as we dress; but the rattling of rail-cars, the giddiness of motion, the anxieties of business, the din and bustle which everywhere surround us, quickly dissipate the impression of what we read, and by noon it is well if we can recollect the place at which we opened.

Or, if ever we do study and search, it is generally for some result sensibly affecting ourselves, either immediately or more remotely. Knowledge is rarely acquired for its own sake. "This machine at which I am laboring, I wish to get a patent for, and make my fortune by it." "This address which I am preparing, I expect to deliver to-night before an applauding assembly." "This

book which I am writing, I shall secure by copy-right, and intend it shall bring me bread, if not fame." "This treatise which I hold in my hand, and in which I have marked certain paragraphs, contains valuable hints for the improvement of my farm or garden;" and so on. *Utility* is the guide which directs our studies; and utility with us is money. Of show, also, our American ambition is, after all, sufficiently fond.

We see the same thing in the productions of the pulpit. How miserably inane are most of the sermons we hear—now, not even "moral essays" composed with care; but a few long apostrophes without their points, pressed home with all the unction of a faultless decorum, and brought to a solemn close in twenty-five minutes by the watches of the gratified audience. Instead of the catechetical discourses of St. Ambrose, and other of the ancient fathers, an hour long, and in which the whole congregation received questions and gave answers out of Scripture, we have now a few rhapsodical, windy periods, to feed souls with. Let any mistaken young preacher attempt "rightly to divide the word of God;" let him dare to be solid, thorough, Scriptural, and close—not to say learned—and his yawning hearers will go away, exclaiming, "How dull!" "How insufferably tedious!" The truth is, sound, scholarlike, and, withal, practical preaching is not relished now-a-days; the folks must have their dinners; and not even the luxury of painted windows, delicious music, and stuffed pews can sustain them through more than half an hour's sitting at the very utmost.

If the justice of these observations be denied, then how comes it that we are so easily deceived? How comes it, that we are so quickly imposed on by every doctrinal novelty, however absurd?—"Judea and all Jerusalem going out" after such prophets as Miller, Matthias, Joe Smith, Owen, and others! Errors, too, on the other side of the line find a congenial soil in our midst. It would seem that radicalism and superstition could not possibly grow together in the same field; and that, if the tendency of our democratic institutions be not, as we would fain hope, toward the former of these extremes, it must certainly restrain us from approaching the latter of them. Such, however, is not the case. Disguise it as we may, there is among us a growing taste for the splendid paraphernalia of superstition. Grand edifices, sonorous music, priestly evolutions, pictorial robes, pleasant perfumes of the smoking incense, and all the other "pomp and circumstance" of church parade, have ever been attractive to the popular mass. They "touch, taste, and handle" these things, just so fast as they can find company enough at their side to wipe off the blush occa-

sioned by their Puritan recollections. As for the doctrines concerned, gone are the good old days when parents were not ashamed to carry their Testaments and their catechisms in their pockets, that they might teach their precious contents "to the child, when they lay down and when they rose up, when they sat in the house and when they walked in the way with him." Novelty takes. Foreign importations are fashionable—as well in creeds as in clothes. Newman's Hagiology and Pusey's sacramental mysticism are better than the heir-loom of our religious fathers. This thumbing of our Bibles has got to be a dull business. True, the dogma may startle us a little at first, because new; but it is plausibly defended; we do not remember any Scripture texts which are against it; it certainly is beyond our comprehension—but so is the Trinity; repeated views render it familiar; from being familiar it becomes agreeable; and so, when circumstances and influences are sufficiently propitious, we then embrace it. Certain it is, as may be seen from statistics, that the distinctive tenets of the Romish Church are and have been, for the last ten years, gaining far beyond the ratio of the national census. There is no body of Christians in the land whose churches, colleges, schools, and asylums, are multiplying at the rate of theirs. It is entirely untrue, to say that only foreigners compose their assemblies. A proportion of these, and in the cities a pretty handsome proportion, consists of native Americans; who sit gazing at their seductive pageantry, and who care little what doctrine is delivered, so long as they are delighted with the sensuous system of sights and sounds which is displayed around them. Our sons and daughters may be found in all their seminaries. A fondness for their peculiar style of worship is extending itself to other sanctuaries, not called by their name; and many of their usages are often defended by those who do not yet profess ostensibly to conform thereto. And our republican antipathy, not against their persons, but against their superstitious practices, appears to be fast dying out. We are, on the whole, gradually loosening our hold upon the ground which we once chose for ourselves. The thing may be slow, may be insensible in its progress; but it is nevertheless taking place.

Now, at a time like this, it is not enough merely to *circulate* the Scriptures—even the Papists are doing this in their Douay. They must be preached, expounded, taught, and enforced. Those passages of them which are alledged in support of false doctrine, should be examined, critically explained, and presented in the form of short treatises; and the people be induced, if possible, to read them. A tract, pointedly written on each of the most important texts in con-

troversy, is, perhaps, what most of all things we need just now. And it is a gratifying sight, when our Biblical critics can so far rise above the influence of their academic habits, as to be able to touch cleverly the point at issue; and will, moreover, condescend to write something smaller than folios, and in a dialect which we can understand, as well as in a size which we can afford to buy. Such a book is now before us;—may it find readers!

The discourse at Capernaum has often been abused to the support of transubstantiation. Wrest this and two or three more places from its supporters, and not a shadow of a color for this idolatrous dogma is left. The sixth of John is, however, the *locus* which is most imperatively urged in its favor; and Dr. Turner "has done a good work" in clearing it from the sacramental meshes which have been cast around it, and placing the chapter in its true light before us.

The first part of his Essay is an examination of Dr. Nicholas Wiseman's four lectures on the discourse, published not long ago in England, and more lately in this country, by Eugene Cummiskey of Philadelphia, with its oriental quotations printed in a manner sufficiently amusing to the learned.

This Dr. Wiseman is a sort of Magnus Apollo, "or great man," as we say, in the Romish communion—having, some time prior to his present work, given to the world a course of lectures on the "Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church;" while his book on the connection of revealed religion with the natural sciences has earned him no little celebrity among those who are not exactly aware how easy it is to make a book when one has a good library. If we mistake not, he has received a cardinal's cap; he is also distinguished for the suavity with which he entertains Protestant inquirers after "Catholic truth;" insomuch that individuals of this description frequently resort to him from that side of the water, and sometimes also, as we hear, from this. His manners, as well as his explanations, are, we infer, well calculated to soften down the features of the church of which he seems to be a kind of public representative. It may be proper to add, that he is a member of the society of Jesuits.

But how comes Dr. Wiseman to attempt the proof of transubstantiation on such ground as this? Is it exactly in character for a Roman Catholic divine to come before the world with a critical exegesis of Scripture in his hand? Can he be ignorant how unfriendly his church is to this mode of proving her doctrines? Does that church ever encourage—except when compelled by the force of circumstances—these appeals "to the law and the testimony?"

Are not the decisions of popes and the decrees of councils her infallible tribunal? Must not we be silent, and believe as we are bidden? Father Simon, one of their most celebrated writers and one of the greatest oriental scholars of his age, has even asserted,—with regard to the Old Testament at least,—"that a greater part of the Hebrew words are equivocal, and that their signification is entirely uncertain;" and that, "for this reason, when a translator employs in his version the interpretation which he thinks the best, he cannot absolutely say that that interpretation expresses truly what is written in the original. There is always good ground to doubt whether the sense which he gives be the true sense, because there are other meanings which are equally probable." Again: "The Protestants do not consider, that the most learned Jews doubt almost everywhere concerning the proper signification of the Hebrew words, and that Hebrew lexicons composed by them commonly contain nothing but uncertain conjectures." This was said with the specious view of recommending traditional authority, and was intended to drive us either into infidelity or into the Church of Rome. It is true, Bossuet repudiated this assertion of Simon, affirming that it went to undermine Christianity itself.* But the bishop of Meaux, it will be remembered, was a Jansenist. The collected voice of the Church of Rome would have then sanctioned, and would unquestionably now sanction, the doctrine of Richard Simon, as it respects not only the Old Testament, but the whole of the sacred writings. Her principle ever has been, and is now, that the people should not be invited to read the Scriptures critically, if at all. Tradition must reach over our shoulder as we read, and point out with her finger the meaning of "that which is written."

We say, then, that Dr. Wiseman has not acted agreeably with the *esprit du corps* of his church. We are not used to hear Scripture quoted and appealed to by such mouths. It looks too much like the devil, coming, as Burkitt quaintly says, "to Christ with a Bible under his arm," when he quoted a verse from the Psalms, "It is written," &c. And whether the cardinal really thinks his own church too dogmatic, or whether he finds it expedient to conform a little more to the genius of the age, and so would humor our Protestant pertinaciousness, or whether he honestly believes that such an absurdity as transubstantiation can be defended on Scripture grounds; in either case, such a procedure is not consistent, is not *homogeneous*, with the system he maintains; it is a

* Campbell's Third Preliminary Dissertation.

piece of new cloth stitched upon an old garment; and the success of the enterprise is what might have been expected, from one who ventures on ground with which he is not very well acquainted, and on which he cannot with any consistency tread.

The gist of the whole controversy lies in the nine consecutive verses, beginning with the 51st and ending with the 59th of the chapter. Before and after this portion, all agree that there is no intended reference to the sacrament. "Dr. Wiseman admits, that until the 48th or 51st verse, 'the discourse refers entirely to believing in Christ;' and that on this point 'Protestants and Roman Catholics are both agreed.'"—*Essay*, p. 3. How, then, comes our Lord all at once to change the subject, without giving the least intimation of it? How comes he to pass from a general doctrine to a particular institution, without saying a single word to apprise his hearers thereof? Dr. Wiseman, however, tells us that such is really the fact. He finds this *transition;* and the stepping-stones of it are the 48th, 49th, 50th, and part of the 51st verses. Here the great Teacher is detected gliding tacitly over from the subject of faith in general, to that of the sacrament in particular. A number of arguments are invented to support this transition. That there is anything in the language expressive of such a change, he does not pretend. But for a case of similar silence he goes to Matt. xxiv, xxv; where the Saviour passes from the destruction of Jerusalem to the destruction of the world in the last day, without verbally announcing the change of subject. But there, Christ speaks as a prophet—here, as a preceptor: there, like one of those ancient seers, he sweeps the whole vista of future time at a glance—here, he is discoursing familiarly to the multitude. The cases, therefore, are not parallel.

Another argument for his transition is the difference of phraseology. "Our opponents," he says, "suppose the phrases in the two portions of the discourse to be parallel, and to refer equally to faith. By this reasoning it will follow, that to eat his flesh, verses 54–57, means the same as to possess the bread of life mentioned in verses 32, 33, 35;" whereas, after showing that "the phrases which occur in the first part of the discourse were calculated to convey to the minds of those who heard the Saviour the idea of listening to his doctrines and believing in him, and the more so as he had positively explained them in this sense," he affirms, "that after the transition a totally different phraseology occurs, which, *to his hearers, could not possibly convey that meaning, nor any other save that of a real eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood.*"—*Essay*, pp. 21, 13.

Now, must a speaker, in treating the same subject, necessarily restrict himself to the same set of words? Must he, in illustrating one and the same truth, confine himself to one and the same figure? May he never, while he continues his original proposition, vary his tropes, or other particulars of his style? If so, our orators and our preachers would be found tedious indeed!

Among Dr. Wiseman's points of this phraseological difference are the two following:—"So long as Christ speaks of himself as the object of faith, under the image of a spiritual food, he represents this food as given by the Father, verses 32, 33, 39, 40, 44: but after verse 47 he speaks of the food, which he now describes, as to be given by *himself*. 'The bread *which I will give* is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,' verse 52. 'How can *this man* give us his flesh to eat,' verse 53. This marked difference in the *giver* of the two communications proposed in the two divisions of the discourse points out that a different *gift* is likewise intended." To this Dr. Turner very pertinently replies:—

"That whether the language of verse 51, 'The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,' be explained of the atonement made by our Lord, 'in his own body on the tree,' or in reference to the Romanist doctrine of the real presence in the eucharist, the orthodox believer in the trinity would hardly deny, that in either case the Father might well be said to be the giver, while the blessing is equally the gift of the Son. The 'marked difference in the giver,' therefore, is rather apparent than real; and no inference can be drawn from it in favor of a 'different gift.' Both the sacred persons give the same thing, which may therefore be stated as the gift of each. The author's language, 'If faith is the gift in both communications,' need hardly be animadverted on, as its inaccuracy is doubtless attributable to haste or inconsideration. Faith is the instrument by which the blessed donation is received. No sound Protestant considers it as the gift itself."—*Essay*, pp. 17, 18.

Again:—"The difference here discernible between the givers is no less marked regarding the effects of the gift. To both are attributed the having everlasting life, and being raised up at the last day. But beyond this there is a marked distinction. In the first part of the discourse our blessed Saviour always speaks of our *coming to him* through the attraction or drawing of the Father," &c. "But after the place where we suppose the transition made, he speaks no longer of our coming to him, but of *our abiding in him and he in us*. And this is a phrase which always intimates union *by love*. . . . . Something, therefore, is here delivered or instituted which tends to nourish and perfect this virtue, (love,) and not faith.

And what institution more suited to answer this end than the blessed eucharist? The topic, therefore, is changed, and a transition has taken place." In answer to this pretty reasoning Dr. Turner says:—

"A plain man would think that 'the difference in the effects' cannot be very 'marked,' if such blessed consequences as 'having everlasting life, and being raised up at the last day,' are equally the result of each. Does Dr. Wiseman mean that 'beyond THIS there is a marked distinction?' . . . He allows everlasting life to be the effect of faith, while, at the same time, he implies that a union with Christ by love, taught exclusively in the latter part of our Lord's discourse, is an effect quite different from and beyond it. Does he mean to teach us, that *everlasting life*, the legitimate 'effect' of faith, is attainable without a union with Christ, and that such union draws after it some other 'effect,' some higher benefit? 'Something,' says he, 'is here delivered or instituted which tends to nourish,' &c. Undoubtedly, there *is* something here delivered and taught which *does* more directly tend to nourish and perfect love, and that something is 'a true and lively faith,' such as Paul describes, Heb. xi, 1; 'which stirreth and worketh inwardly in the heart.'* Why then should we suppose that the topic is changed? Why is not the same living principle acting in all its holy energy upon the object which, most of all, is likely to call forth its efficiency, that is, the one sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, still to be regarded as the sole topic of our Lord's discourse throughout? There is evidently no reason for supposing a change of subject at all; but, if there were, the newly-introduced topic would be, by the author's own showing, 'a union with Christ by love.' Any special reference to the eucharist would be, I do not say inadmissible, but certainly unnecessary."—*Essay*, pp. 18–21.

There are several other nice distinctions adduced by Dr. Wiseman, which are obliterated with equal ease by the pen of his examiner. Certain statements occur in his collation of passages in this chapter, altogether too loose and inaccurate for any one professing to be a Biblical critic.

This last remark is true also of statements about the versions. Take as a specimen what he says of the Syriac version of the New Testament. His aim is to show, that, in the languages of the East, "*to eat the flesh* of a person, invariably signifies, when spoken metaphorically, *to attempt to do him* some serious injury, principally by calumny or false accusation;" and, therefore, that "such was the only figurative meaning which the phrases could present to the audience at Capernaum." He says, then, "that the name διάβολος (devil) is translated throughout the Syriac version of the New

* See Homily entitled "A Short Declaration," &c.

Testament by אכל קרצא, *ochel kartzo, the eater of flesh.*" Dr. Turner says:—

"The fact stands thus:—The word *διάβολος* occurs in the New Testament thirty-eight times; in nineteen of which the Syriac version does not employ this expression, but four others. Once, Luke viii, 12, it uses a compound term, denoting *enemy;* once, Acts x, 38, the word for *wicked* or *evil;* three times, in Revelation, a word synonymous with *impostor, deceiver;* and in fourteen other places, [he gives the texts,] the word Satan. The representation of Dr. Wiseman is true only of the nineteen other places in which the word *διάβολος* is found."—*Essay*, p. 25.

How far inaccuracies like this can consist with the character of a true scholar, the reader must judge for himself.

Dr. Wiseman adduces Tholuck in support of his imaginary "transition;" saying "that an acute modern Protestant commentator has observed, that it is manifest that our Saviour cannot have been understood to continue the same subject at verse 51." Dr. Turner says:—

"It would be unjust to Tholuck, to allow him to be understood as expressing the view which this statement naturally implies. He is explaining the whole passage from verses 51 to 59 inclusive; and on citing the latter half of verse 51, 'And the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world,' he remarks, that 'the language *καὶ*——*δὲ*, denoting a *more extended development* of the thought, shows that Christ does not here express the same which he had declared before.' Tholuck's very next words are, —'Having represented, *in general*, his appearance in humanity as a divine food, he now intends to show in what sense it is so *particularly*. If his intention had been to express by these words *only the very same* idea before conveyed, no reason can be given why he should change the quite clear expression, "I am the living bread," for the somewhat obscure one, "I will give you my flesh." The future, "*I will* give," refers to something yet to take place.' He means Christ's death, as he afterward explains it. The same judicious distinction between the general thought and a more particular development of it had been clearly stated on the preceding page, where the profoundly learned and pious author remarks, that 'an accurate examination of the whole connection, and of the particular phrases employed, shows that a *more special* meaning must be connected with these expressions, namely, that Christ having before *only in a general* way represented his incarnation as a divine living power, now makes prominent what was able, in *a sense altogether peculiar*, to convey that power of life—that is to say, his *redeeming death* as the crowning point of his redeeming life.' Had Dr. Wiseman read the work to which he refers, in confirmation of his own imagined transition to a new section of our Lord's discourse? And if so, does he call this representation of his author's views a fair one?"—*Ib.*, pp. 11, 12.*

* Dr. Turton, his transatlantic opponent, had charged him with a similar misrepresentation of that prince of modern commentators, Tittmann. How does

Wiseman labors at this "transition" throughout from the beginning of his first to the end of his second lecture, and there he at last quits it.

The argument of his third and fourth lectures may be stated briefly as follows:—

1. The multitude whom our Lord was addressing were *all* sincere and ardent seekers after truth.

2. He delivered something which they could not understand; they took offense at it; and some of them even "went back and walked no more with him."

3. That something was the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood—"this is a hard saying; who can hear it?"

4. Our Lord's "constant practice was, whenever his expressions were erroneously taken in their literal sense, and he meant them to be figurative, instantly to explain himself, and let his hearers know that his words were to be taken figuratively."

5. He made no such explanation in this case, which, for the sake of saving the disaffected from apostasy, he certainly would have done, had any figurative elucidation been possible.

6. Ergo, he must have intended these words in the literal sense of them; and, ergo, the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood, is to eat and drink them in the sacrament of transubstantiation.

our friend Wiseman clear himself? Why, verily, thus:—"I quoted the *Meletemata Sacra*. I suppose the learned professor was unacquainted with the work; so, like a good controversialist—certainly not like a good scholar—he goes to another work of Tittmann's, and from that attempts to confute me. This is his *Commentary* on St. John. Now in this, Tittmann, being a Protestant, interprets our Lord's discourse Protestantly, and says, 'apud nostros,' that is, among German Protestants, there is no doubt that no reference is here intended to the blessed sacrament. . . . The words from the *Meletemata* are as clear as those from the *Commentary;* nor will any quotation from the latter invalidate the former."

On this, Dr. Turner gravely remarks:—"The scholar will know what to think of this. The merely general reader will hardly believe me, when I assure him that the Meletemata Sacra is the same book as the Commentary; that the very words, 'apud nostros,' (to which the learned author adds, 'nec apud verum doctum esse potest,' showing that he had no idea of limiting the [illegible] to 'German Protestants,') occur on p. 272; and, moreover, that the edition quoted by Wiseman is that of Leipsic, 1816, the title-page of which is as follows:—'Caroli Christiani Tittmanni, Theol. Doct., etc., etc., Meletemata Sacra sive Commentarius Exegetico-Criticus Dogmaticus in Evangelium Joannis.'" Now what is this but a piece of tergiversation for which any school-boy would deserve to be soundly flogged!

What a fine-looking argument is here! What a pity to knock it in pieces! He assumes that the audience at Capernaum was a school of "ardent and enthusiastic hearers."—No such thing.

"He confounds two distinct facts, namely; the feeding mentioned in Matt. xv, and Mark viii, with the one which is narrated in John vi, and which gave rise to the discourse recorded in the same chapter. We are told, John vi, 22, 23, that 'the people came to Capernaum, seeking for Jesus, the day following' the miraculous feeding; consequently they had enjoyed a good meal the day before. If they were the 'ardent and enthusiastic hearers' which it is all-important to his argument to represent them, how comes Christ to open his discourse with such a charge as this:—'Verily, verily, I say unto you, you seek me because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled?' To these '*ardent and enthusiastic hearers*' he solemnly says:—'Ye have seen me and believe not,' verse 37. He intimates to them in terms not obscure, that they are not under the Father's influence; for they 'murmured at him because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven;' and they went on to ask among themselves, contemptuously, 'Is not this *Jesus* the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?' &c. Dr. Wiseman has totally misapprehended the character of these men; he has confounded them with others, who appear to have been of a different disposition, by identifying two distinct and independent facts; and this in a 'Theological Course of Lectures delivered at Rome, and, in order to do ample justice to the line of argument pursued,' not only repeatedly delivered, but published, and of course revised and prepared for the press."—*Essay*, pp. 42, 43.

But it is written, that "many of his *disciples* went back and walked no more with him." Well, must this necessarily have been because they could not comprehend the problem of transubstantiation, expressed in the words, "Eat my flesh," &c.? Was not our Lord at this time in the zenith of popular favor, occasioned by the splendid wonders he had lately wrought? Might there not have been some, following in his train and calling themselves his disciples, who did this from mercenary motives, arising from the wrong views which they had of his mission and kingdom, and whose discipulary attachment would then terminate on the discovery of their mistake? May we not suppose that a crucified Messiah, a feeding on him by faith in the heart, and a life of continued self-denial, would be enough to offend such disciples? Or must we suppose that they rejoined the fickle multitude, only because they could not solve the mystery of the real presence! Of this we may rest assured, that if they had been Christ's disciples in reality, as they were in name, if they had been in truth God's children born from above, they would not have stumbled at *anything* which their Master might have propounded. But finding that he was to be a Saviour and a

N 79?063

king, in a very different sense from what they had imagined when they joined the company of his followers, they were disappointed; and for this it was, that these "disciples went away and walked no more with him:"—they had "no root in themselves."

Thus the first and principal assumption—the docile disposition of the hearers—on which this fine argument is based, is utterly false, and the whole superstructure falls to the ground. Such an error might have been pardonable in Coleridge,* who was not a professed divine; but is it so in one who, like Cardinal Wiseman, sets up for an expounder of the word of God?

Nor is that other assumption of his, that our Lord always explained himself whenever his hearers mistook the literal for the figurative sense, true. Dr. Turner says:—

"Undoubtedly, our Lord did very often explain his meaning. But to infer from ordinary practice a universal invariable usage, without a single exception, cannot be admitted. There might be strong reasons, and not always ascertainable by us, for omitting explanation in particular cases. It was chiefly to those who were really in search of the truth, that he was at the pains to explain himself. 'Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God; but unto them that are without, all these things are done in parables.' 'Without a parable spake he not unto them, and when they were alone he expounded all things to his disciples.' Mark iv, 11, 34. In Matt. xvi, 4, indignant at the people's continued want of faith, notwithstanding the most direct evidence, he declares that no sign should be given them but that of the prophet Jonas, without explaining wherein that sign consisted; and in xxi, 27, he expressly refuses to tell 'by what authority' he acted. The cases in John ii, 19, 20, and in iv, 10–15, where his figurative language is misunderstood, and he adds nothing explanatory of it, are examined by Wiseman; who then, in express words and with singular inconsistency, abandons the very rule which he had set out on his 107th page, namely; that 'our Lord's constant practice was to explain himself,' &c.: and now, on pp. 117, 119, he says,—'I have never said that our Saviour was bound to answer the objections of the Jews; but I have examined his practice only *when he did answer or explain*, and have found that his conduct was precisely that of an upright and honest teacher, who *corrected mistakes* and enforced his doctrines without fear. But in the case of John ii, *he deems it right to give no answer at all*, and the passage only proves that our Saviour *sometimes declined answering an objection*,' (he should have said explaining a figure.) . . . The avowed abandonment of his own principle entirely precludes the necessity of a more minute examination of his remark."—*Essay*, pp. 30, 31.

---

* See his "Aids to Reflection."

The following is a curious specimen of the way in which a hasty man will sometimes get taken in his own snare. He says, "Our Lord makes a distinction between eating his body and drinking his blood; a distinction without any real signification or force, if he be not speaking of the real presence; for to partake of the blood of Christ by faith, adds nothing to the idea of partaking of his body;" —an unlucky statement, which his acute examiner thus turns back upon him :—

"If there really be such a *significant and forcible distinction*, and if the command *to drink the blood* is as unlimited as that *to eat the flesh*, on what ground of Scripture or reason do Dr. Wiseman and his coadjutors withhold the *blood* from the people, that very blood which has such a *distinctive force and significancy?*"—*Essay*, p. 34.

But it is now time that we give some attention to our essayist's own exposition of the discourse. As has been already observed, the *onus* of the entire controversy lies within the compass of verses 51–59 inclusive. "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man," &c.:—the question is, Is there anything in the laws of Biblical criticism which forbids our interpreting this language of *faith?* that is, "the duty and the rewards of a living faith in the Redeemer, with the fuller and more distinct development, however, than had been before made, of the atoning sacrifice which was to be effected by his death, and the necessity of this faith acting on it, in order to secure the pardon of sin, the mystical union of the believer with his Lord, and, by consequence, his attainment of present spiritual life, of future resurrection, and of eternal happiness."

Nothing is more common in the Scriptures than to apply words, denoting food and drink, to the devout reception of moral and religious truth into the mind. "Thy words were found, and I did *eat* them; and thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of my heart." Jer. xv, 16. "Son of man, *eat* that I give; eat this roll; *cause thy belly to eat, and fill thy bowels* with this roll that I give thee." Ezek. ii, 8; iii, 1–3. Wisdom personified says, "They that eat me shall yet be hungry, and they that drink me shall yet be thirsty,"—shall be desirous of more. Eccles. xxiv, 25. Similar language abounds in the Book of Canticles.

"The same figure is employed by the later Jewish writers. Thus the rabbins say, that 'every eating and drinking mentioned in the Book of Ecclesiastes refers to the law and to good works;'* and

* "This is a quotation from the Midrash Koheleth, and has been repeatedly cited by commentators."

Maimonides employs similar language when he speaks of 'filling the stomach with bread and meat,' while he means to express the idea of 'knowing what is lawful and unlawful.'* Passages have been cited also from the Talmud, in illustration of our Lord's language, and to them I must now request the reader's attention, and the more particularly, as they are commented on by Dr. Wiseman, who quotes them from Lightfoot."

Dr. Turner, whose Talmudic studies have been extensive, here follows with an extract from this rabbinical Thesaurus, which is curious in many respects, but which want of space compels us to omit, save that portion of it which more immediately relates to the subject in hand:—"Rab says Israel are about *to eat the years* of the Messiah. Says Rabbi Joseph, true; but who *eats of him?* Do Hillel and Billek† *eat of him?* in opposition to the words of Hillel, who said, there is no Messiah; for a long time ago *they ate him* in the days of Hezekiah." Rashe's gloss on the words, "Israel are about to eat the years of the Messiah," is, "Israel are about to eat the *abundance of the times* of the Messiah."

Lightfoot comments on this passage—which he cites together with its gloss—thus: "Behold *eating the Messiah*, and yet no complaints upon the phraseology. Hillel is, indeed, blamed for saying that the Messiah was so eaten that he will no longer be for Israel; but on the form of speech not the slightest scruple is expressed. For they clearly understood what was meant by the *eating of the Messiah;* that is, that in the days of Ezechias, they became partakers of the Messiah, received him with avidity, embraced him joyfully, and as it were absorbed him."‡

Dr. Wiseman, who apparently owes to Lightfoot all he knows of the Talmud, after getting from him the passage in question, thus disputes his comment thereon as above given:—"The Jewish doctors themselves did not understand the words of Hillel in Lightfoot's sense. These are the words of the Talmud: 'Rab said, Israel will *eat the years* of the Messiah. (The gloss explains this by the abundance of *the times* of the Messiah will belong to Israel!) Rab Joseph said truly, but who will eat of IT? (*the abundance.*)

* "Jad Hazakah, Grounds of the Law, cap. iv, *ad fin.*, fol. 7, vol. i, Amsterdam edition."

† Two judges of ancient Sodom, as Rashe thinks.

‡ See Pittman's edition, vol. xii, p. 296, Heb. and Talmud. Exercitations upon St. John. In the older editions of Lightfoot these Exercitations are called his Hebraicæ Horæ; in that of Rotterdam, 1686, see vol. ii, p. 626; in that of London, 1684, vol. ii, p. 554.

Will Chillek and Billek eat of IT? This was said to meet the saying of Hillel,' &c."

The reader will please to take notice that the parentheses, *italics,* and capitals, in this place are all Dr. Wiseman's. He continues:—"The rabbins, therefore, understood the words of this doctor, not as applying to the Messiah, but to the *abundance of his times;* and then the figure is not in *eating*, but in the word *Messiah.* Did they understand him rightly? Then Lightfoot's interpretation is totally wrong, and no parallelism exists between these words and those of our Saviour; for he certainly did not mean to inculcate the necessity of eating the abundance of his times. Did they misunderstand Hillel, and was it only Dr. Lightfoot who first arrived at his meaning? Then it follows that Hillel, in these phrases, departed from the intelligible use of language, and consequently ceases to be a criterion for explaining it."

This lofty pæan is raised over Lightfoot on a foundation utterly fictitious. In order to destroy the inference resulting from Rab's expression, "But who shall *eat of him?*" and from Hillel's, "*They ate him* in the days of Hezekiah," Dr. Wiseman has introduced Rashe's gloss in the place of the important words in these phrases, and has left them as though they had been originally spoken by Rab and Hillel just as he has altered them. The pronoun IT, by which he translates the original Hebrew suffix הּ, is printed in capitals, —as if to make his dishonesty or stupidity more glaringly conspicuous—and this IT is made to relate to its supposed antecedent, "*abundance.*" Thus, for "eat of *him*," we have "eat of *it;*" and for "they ate *him*," "they ate *it*," all along.

This Rashe (his full name is Rabbi Solomon Jarchi) was, as the learned well know, a glossist, or sort of scholiast, on the Talmud, who lived no less than eleven hundred years after Rab and Hillel; and yet here is Dr. Wiseman giving us his gloss on their words, as the very words which they themselves had written —and that too, when, not their meaning simply, but their particular phraseology is the very point at issue. In the language of the essayist, "What would be thought of a professor of Greek, who, in expounding Homer, should take an imaginary antecedent to one of the great poet's pronouns out of his commentator, Eustathius, and particularly when another antecedent, and the true one, had already been expressed by the bard himself?"—*Essay*, p. 88, *seq.*

Dr. Wiseman should be counseled to keep out of the Talmud in future; such excursions do him no honor. There are those here, if there are none at the English college at Rome, who are

able to detect his mendacities, and to follow him into these waters of rabbinic lore far beyond his own depth.*

After all, what would be gained even if these phrases of "eating the Messiah" really were as he represents them? Does not Christ himself—in the part of the chapter not under debate—virtually say the same thing? Does he not speak of a certain bread that must be eaten in order to life; and then does he not expressly declare that *he is that bread?* And is not, therefore, to eat *that bread*, to eat *him?* Are not Christ and the bread identically the same thing under different names? And is not the same word, *eat*, equally applicable to both?

But Dr. Wiseman contends, that even if the phrase, "to eat the Messiah," could mean "to receive and embrace him, the expression to eat the *flesh* of the Messiah is totally different, and that the least departure from established phraseology plunges us into obscurity and nonsense."

To this wholesale assertion Dr. Turner replies:—

"That words and phrases often take their determinate meaning from the particular occasion and circumstances which gave rise to their use, by which also their meaning is often modified; so that all 'obscurity' is thereby removed. Our author does himself recognize the principle here stated, and I am happy to confirm its correctness by his authority. 'Philology is not conducted merely by taking the abstract meaning of words and applying them to any passage, but by studying them in peculiar circumstances.'—P. 127. The case before us proves the truth of this; for it is undeniable that some of the best critics and commentators, both of ancient and modern times, have agreed in giving to the expressions, 'to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Messiah,' a meaning which, Dr. Wiseman says, implies a 'departure from established phraseology,' without either 'obscurity' or 'nonsense.' There is, in truth, neither nonsense in the meaning, nor necessary obscurity in the language which conveys it. The 'bread' to be eaten is expressly declared by our Saviour to be his *flesh*. It is evident, therefore, that eating the bread, in verses 48, 50, 51, is identical with eating the flesh. Whatever the one means the other must also mean. The language, 'except ye eat,' &c., in verses 53–56, is suggested by that in which the objection is couched, in verse 52, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' To which the words, 'and drink the blood,' are added, simply to particularize, so as to denote a thorough partaking; and the whole is an amplification of the thought before expressed, in verses 51, 52, namely, the 'eating of the bread which came down from heaven.' And in verses 56, 57, 58, the phrases, 'eateth my flesh and drinketh

* It is remarkable that Dr. Turton, who answered Wiseman's Lectures in England, makes no mention either of his perversion of this place in the Talmud, or of his misrepresentations of the Syriac version, Tholuck, or Tittmann.

my blood,' 'eateth me,' 'eateth of this bread,' are manifestly identical in meaning. The amplification may be illustrated by Eph. v, 30, where the apostle, after stating of true Christians, that they 'are members of Christ's body,' immediately adds, in order to show more particularly the intimacy of the union intended, 'of his flesh and of his bones.' (Compare the language of the Israelites to David,—'We are thy bone and thy flesh.') To suppose that he intends to denote a personal identity thereby, would be a monstrous extravagance, unsupported by Scripture, and tending directly to a species of pantheism; and, moreover, contrary to the marriage relation which gives occasion to the language."—*Essay*, p. 78, 79.

Dr. Turner says above, that the language of our Lord, "Except ye eat the flesh," &c., is suggested by that of his opponents, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" &c.: he says also on page 82 of his Essay, that "he adopts [in the use of this figure] the very terms of his opponents." Now we think that this is hardly correct, —that is, if we understand him aright. Our Lord was certainly the first to use the term, "*flesh*;" for their question, "How can this man," &c., was raised upon that which he had said immediately before—"The bread which I will give is my *flesh*, which I will give," &c. He was, also, the first to use the word *eat*,—though not in immediate connection with "flesh." This, however, would naturally follow from what he had before said. Their question is the logical conclusion from his foregoing propositions. They were to eat of a certain "*bread*:" that "bread was his *flesh*, which he would give," &c.: they then ask, "How can this man give us his *flesh to eat?*" &c.

This, however, is not a matter of much importance. The last paragraph we have quoted from the Essay imbodies the solution of the whole chapter. The clause, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give," &c., is the vinculum which unites the one part of the discourse with the other, and shows that they both mean the same thing; that is, *faith* in the atonement which Christ was to make in his own person on the cross. How can it be said, that the "bread," spoken of in the former part of the chapter, signifies a different thing from the "flesh," spoken of in the latter? that the "bread" is Christ in general received by faith, while the "flesh" is Christ specifically received, in the sacrament of the real presence, by the mouth? when Christ himself makes them identical the one with the other, saying, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Tittmann concedes that the Protestant interpretation is not after the *usus loquendi* of Scripture. But is the Romish interpretation any the more so? Dr. Wiseman, however, greedily snaps at this

concession of Tittmann, and then pronounces, "that we must not admit *any* expression to be figurative, which is not figurative according to the established phraseology of Scripture." Now what is this but saying, that Christ cannot use language which is altogether peculiar to himself? That he cannot adopt a figure or a form of speech, unless he has a specific example of it somewhere else in the Bible? This is rhetoric with a vengeance! Such nicetics would better become the mouth of a Lord Kaimes than that of a theologian. A very good reason can be given why this phrase, "to eat the flesh," &c., is a figure for which no exact parallel can be found in the Bible elsewhere; namely, because there is no Jesus Christ, either before or after the four Gospels, present on earth to use this figure in his own proper person. What patriarch, what prophet, what king, what *any one* of the inspired writers was there, besides Christ, who could use this language in any sense whatever? Indeed, the *usus loquendi* is as much against the figure of "bread," as applied to a *person*, as it is against the figure of "flesh," so applied. For who but Christ could ever have said this of himself, (we mean *figuratively*)—"I am the living bread which came down from heaven, of which if a man eat he shall never die?" Plainly, then, if the figurative sense of the word "flesh" is to be rejected, because no precisely similar phrase can be found elsewhere, so also must the figurative sense of the word "bread" be rejected, for the same reason. Only Christ could use these terms in any sense, whether figurative or otherwise, in their application to a *person;* because to him only as a person—the great atoning person—were they in any sense applicable.

If it be asked, why he should have changed from the figure of "bread" to that of "flesh," it undoubtedly was (as Tholuck says) to denote more distinctly the propitiation which he was to make by offering himself up as a *sacrifice*,—the word sacrifice generally conveying the notion of *flesh*, the flesh of the victim which is immolated, and Christ also being to have his flesh pierced and his blood shed on the cross. We say, "to denote more *distinctly* his propitiation;" for the idea had all along been implied under the figure of bread; only he brings it out more openly under the new figure of "his flesh."

The truth is, bread and flesh, being the two staple articles of food, and uniting their significations in the word *meat*, are the same general figure employed throughout the chapter. When our Lord says, "The bread which I will give is my flesh," &c., his hearers immediately catch at the word *flesh*, murmuring, "How can this man give us?" &c. Christ then holds on upon the word, and "in-

sists upon the necessity of their doing what they regarded as impracticable and absurd, in order to obtain spiritual life; he enjoins it with a strong asseveration, with particularity of expression, employing the words, 'drink the blood, as well as, 'eat the flesh of the Son of man.'"

"The increased strength and boldness of the terms will appear natural to all who patiently attend to the circumstances. They are in analogy with other Scriptural representations, of which I shall adduce a single instance. St. Paul, delineating the inward working of the natural mind, when reason is acting on the subject of religious obligation, and the conscience is in some measure alive to a regard to it, while at the same time the grace of the gospel is wanting, uses the language, '*I consent* unto the law that it is good.' This simply expresses acquiescence in its excellence. But afterward, becoming more warmed with the subject, and desiring to state as fully as possible the completeness of this acquiescence of reason and conscience, he employs a stronger term, '*συνήδομαι, I delight in*, or *am pleased with*, the law of God, after the inner man.' The expressions, 'eat the flesh and drink the bood of the Son of man,' when considered in relation to the language, 'eat me,' are similar to the latter word of St. Paul in relation to the former. In each case both expressions designate the same thing, the one being only more fervid and energetic than the other."—*Essay*, pp. 82, 83.

The general objections which lie against the Papal, or indeed any sacramental view whatever, of these verses, are stated by the essayist with perspicuity and force. There is one, however, which he appears not to have brought out in all the amplitude and strength which he might have done, had not his effort been principally a critical exegesis of the chapter itself. It is the *á priori* utter improbability that our Saviour should have been discoursing on such a subject under such circumstances. The sacrament of the holy supper is a subject proper to be pressed, not upon the unregenerate, but upon those who have attained to somewhat in the divine life. Repentance, faith, knowledge, and religious affection are all previously necessary, (in what particular measure of them we say not,) in order to any profitable introduction of this mystery. Accordingly it was not instituted by Him whose death it was to commemorate, until the night before that death, and then only in presence of the twelve, and in the retirement of "an upper room." And yet, as Dr. Wiseman would have us believe, here is our Saviour, a whole year prior to his death, urging the obligation and the benefits of this ordinance upon a carnal, captious assemblage of persons, who as yet were destitute of the very rudiments of the religion of the cross; who, as their language shows, were as igno-

rant of the true character of Christ, of the great end for which he came into the world, and of the means by which he was to accomplish it, as it was well possible for men to be; who understood well enough what it was to have their stomachs filled with loaves and fishes, but for the spiritual bread which feeds the soul, had, as Augustin saith, "the jaws of the heart languid; with open ears, were nevertheless deaf, and though they saw, yet remained blind."* *Credat Judæus Apella—non ego.* Jesus Christ was a judicious teacher. He always chose his topics, as well as the style of treating them, in reference to the character of his auditors. And it is worthy of note that, save the place here alledged, there is not in the whole four Gospels another allusion to this ordinance discoverable, till its final institution at the close of our Lord's earthly career.

It is commonly imagined that the early fathers of the church take the sacramental view of John vi; and, further, that this view is definitely declared by them in the form of set expositions. Now such is not the fact. The fathers have left no formal treatises on the chapter—like this of Dr. Wiseman, for example; they never handle it dogmatically, or controversially; and, moreover, what they do say favors the Protestant rather than the Papal interpretation. To say the least, their verdict is so far from being decisive in itself, that "modern theologians differ in their views of the exposition given by these fathers of the chapter under consideration; some contending that they understood it directly of the eucharist, while others maintain that they only apply part of its language to this sacrament." In this opposition stand Johnson and Waterland, two of the most eminent divines of the English Church; the former, "conceiving that the fathers never doubted but that the mystical, or sacramental, sense was that which the Saviour primarily intended; while the latter held, that they only sometimes *applied* what our Saviour there says to the sacrament, having first *interpreted* it, in its original designation, of *faith*. This distinction he thinks important." "For example, the words, 'except ye eat the flesh,' &c., 'you have no life in you,' do not mean directly, that you have no life without the eucharist, but that you have no life in you without participating in our Lord's passion. Nevertheless, since the eucharist is one way of participating in the passion, and a very considerable one, it was very pertinent and proper to urge the doctrine of that chapter, both for the clearer understanding of the beneficial nature of the eucharist, and for the

* Quoted in the Essay, p. 46.

exciting of Christians to a frequent and devout reception of it. Such was the use which some of the early fathers made of John vi."

But we are not left in this matter to the representations of others. Dr. Turner, whose philological studies have evidently not been pursued at the expense of patristic researches, has hunted up everything written on this chapter by the most celebrated fathers of the first four centuries; and having translated the extracts, has incorporated them in Part III of his Essay, accompanied by their originals; so that the reader can form his own opinion on the point. Most probably, however, nearly every one will acquiesce in the conclusion which he himself has drawn:—"That the obscurity of the inspired page is not always removed by the expositions of even the best of these writers; and that the interpretation may chance to be no clearer than the text, and equally to require philological investigation and antiquarian research."

The following passage from Ignatius, with the remarks of our essayist thereon, we think worthy of quotation:—

"'Let no one deceive himself; unless any one be within the altar he is deprived of the bread of God.'* It is assumed by Johnson as undeniable that Ignatius uses this language of the Lord's supper: 'By calling the eucharist the bread of God he clearly refers to John vi, 33; it is certain that by that phrase he means the eucharist.' But so far is this from being certain, that it does not appear even probable. The language is used in the same sense as in the verse referred to; that is to say, of Christ himself, who came from God to be the author and sustainer of spiritual life to us. This alone would be sufficient reason for applying to him such figurative language; but inasmuch as the phrase is frequently used of sacrifices under the law,† it, doubtless, is chosen with the intention of representing him as also the great sacrifice whereby alone God is propitiated. In John vi, 33, our Saviour calls himself, and afterward Ignatius calls him, 'the bread of God,' as he was a sacrifice for the sins of the world, and to be mysteriously eaten as such. Some will no doubt think that Johnson's opinion is favored by the word '*altar.*' But it is a mistake to suppose that Ignatius intends this word to designate the Lord's table. That author understands it of the 'altar-room,' by being called up into which, and there 'eating the sacrifice,' he says, that 'Christian people are dignified beyond the old peculium,' (the Jews,) and 'within which all communicants did unquestionably, in Ignatius's time, go, in order to receive the eucharist:' although afterward, 'they were prohibited from entering the altar-room.' He avoids the absurdity of the literal meaning of persons being within an altar, by giving a sense to the word which is wholly unfounded, and by adhering to a literal meaning of the whole clause, alike unworthy of the martyr and

* Epistle to Ephesians. Μηδεὶς πλανάσθω ἐὰν μὴ τ. κλ.

† Leviticus xxi, 6, 8, 17, 22; xxii, 25.

his subject, and inconsistent with the peculiar circumstances under which he wrote. There is hardly any reason to doubt that here, and in the three other places in which the term occurs, Ignatius uses it in a figurative sense for the church, or for Christ himself, in connection with whom, as around an altar or in a temple, all spiritual blessings do, as it were, cluster. That in the place just cited he means the church, is evident from the preceding context, and from that which immediately follows. The whole passage runs thus: 'How must I esteem you happy who are so intimately united with him, (the bishop,) as the church is with Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ with the Father, that all things may accord in unity! Let no one deceive himself. Unless any one be within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God.' To the Magnesians he says, 'There is one Lord Jesus Christ, than whom nothing is more excellent. Run together, therefore, all as to one temple, as to one altar, as to one Jesus Christ.' Cap. vii. To the Trallians—'He that is within the altar is pure.' Cap. vii. In both these places the meaning is also plain. In the only remaining one in which the word occurs, in the Epistle to the Philadelphians, it might be understoood of the Lord's table, and has often been so explained. See Suicer's Thesaurus, under *θυσιαστηριον*, ii, 1, d; Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, No. II, and Tholuck on Heb. xiii, 10. The words are these:—'There is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for unity in his blood, one altar.' Cap. iv. Still I cannot but think that a careful attention to the context, and particularly the chapter next preceding, will satisfy the reader that the meaning already suggested is preferable. The apostolic man is urging those to whom he writes to unity, and the term *altar* may with as much propriety be understood of the church as of the Lord's table; and the probability that such is its meaning here is strengthened by the fact that such is the undoubted sense of it elsewhere. The context is as follows:—'As many as shall repent and come to the unity of the church, these shall be God's, that they may live according to Jesus Christ. Be not deceived, my brethren. If any one follow a schismatic, he shall not inherit the kingdom of God. If any walk after a different opinion, he is not in harmony with Christ's passion. Be careful, therefore, to use one eucharist; for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for unity in his blood, one altar.' It is very surprising that any one should wish to give to these places a meaning which refers chiefly to what is material or local."—*Essay*, pp. 112, 113.

Let the reader also mark well the language of the following, extracted from the writings of Augustin:—"They said to him, 'What shall we do that we may work the work of God?' For he had said to them, 'Work for the food that doth not perish, but endureth to eternal life.' 'What shall we do?' say they; 'by observing what shall we be able fully to perform this precept? Jesus answered and said to them, 'This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.' This, therefore, is to eat the meat which doth not perish, but endureth to everlasting life. Why do you pre-

pare the teeth and stomach? Believe and thou hast eaten*—no one fulfills the law but he who is aided by grace, that is, the bread which comes down from heaven. Love is the fulfilling of the law, the compendium of it, as the apostle says; love, not of money, but of God—love, not of earth, not of heaven, but of him who made heaven and earth. Whence is this love to man? Let us hear him: The love of God, says he, is poured forth into our hearts by the Holy Spirit whom he hath given us. The Lord being about to give the Holy Spirit, called himself the bread which came down from heaven, exhorting us to believe in him. For to believe in him, this is to eat the living bread. He who believes, is invisibly nourished, (literally, fattened,) because he is invisibly born again."

That the sacramental interpretation of John vi should become prominent was, of course, to be expected, just in proportion as the religious condition of the church tended to the external and ceremonial, in contradistinction to the inward, and the condition signified by the typical adumbration. And such was really the fact. Yet, even in those periods of comparative ignorance, which we have probably been too apt to turn away from with disgust, as the dark ages, unworthy of notice, in which nothing is expected to be found which will repay the trouble of search, glimpses of the pure ray may be seen, proving that the "holy light" was far from being quenched; and that the same blessed Spirit who beamed upon the soul of the beloved disciple, still "shone inward," and taught the hearts of his faithful people. Let any one read the commentary of the venerable Bede, of the eighth century, on our Lord's discourse at Capernaum, and while he will recognize the sacramental interpretation, he cannot fail to perceive also, that the leading current of the author's mind sets toward the spiritual: "*Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.* That manna was significant of the imperishable meat, and all those signs were of me. My signs ye loved; what was signified thereby ye despise.—*And the bread which I will give is my flesh, &c.* Whosoever will live, let him believe in Christ, let him eat spiritually the spiritual food, and become incorporated with the body of Christ, and let him not be a corrupt member meriting excision; let him be fair and sound, fit for his Head." Then he proceeds, in the words of St. Augustin, "to eat that food and to drink that drink is this, to abide in Christ and to have Christ abiding in us. He, therefore, who does not abide in Christ and in whom Christ does not abide, beyond a doubt, does not spiritually

* Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti. In Johan. Evang.

eat his flesh, although carnally and visibly he may press with his teeth the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, but rather eats and drinks the sacrament of so great a thing to his judgment, because, impure, he presumes to approach to Christ's sacraments, of which no one but the pure can worthily partake."* In another place he explains the last-cited verse both of the eucharist and of the atonement on the cross: "This bread the Lord then gave when he delivered the mystery of his body and blood to the disciples, and when he offered himself to God the Father on the altar of the cross."†

The sacramental view is prominent in the exposition of the Bulgarian metropolitan of the eleventh century, Theophylact, although he does not entirely lose sight of the spiritual and higher sense: "*The bread which I will give, &c.* Here he evidently speaks of the mystical reception of his body. But indicating his right,—for not as a slave (servant, δοῦλος) and inferior to his Father, he was crucified, but willingly,—he says, 'I will give my flesh for the life of the world,' &c. But consider that the bread which is eaten by us in the mysteries is not a type of the Lord's flesh, but the flesh itself: for he did not say, the bread which I will give is the type of my flesh,—but, *is my flesh.* For, through the mystical blessing and the addition of the Holy Spirit, it is transformed by inexplicable (literally, ineffable, ἀπορρήτοις) words to the flesh of the Lord. And now, therefore, the bread is changed into the Lord's body." But still he does not forget the necessity of an inward character correspondent with the holiness of the sacramental elements. "When, therefore, we hear the words, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son ye have no life,' it becomes us, in receiving the divine mysteries, to have unwavering faith, and not to inquire into the manner: for the animal man, that is, he who is led by human and carnal, or natural reasonings, doth 'not receive what is supernatural and spiritual,' and therefore has no conception of what the spiritual food of the Lord's flesh means."‡ Let us look now at the language of the celebrated abbot of Clairvaulx in the twelfth century. St. Bernard speaks of "a three-fold reception of the body and blood of the Lord. The first is both sacramental and spiritual, of which the Lord says, He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood

* Breviarium Evangelii D. Joannis, cap. vi; Opera, Colon., tom. v, col. 509, 510.

† D. Thomæ Aquinatis Doct. Angel. Ord. Præd. Opera, Venet. 1775, 4to., tom. iv, p. 429; Super Joannis Evangelium Catena, cap. vi.

‡ Commentarius in Joannem, cap. vi. Opera, Venet. 1754, tom. i, pp. 593–595.

dwelleth in me and I in him. And again: He that eateth me shall live on account* of me. The second, which is only spiritual, as the Lord himself says again, The flesh profiteth nothing, it is the spirit that quickeneth: as if he had said, If ye understand a carnal reception only without grace, it is of no use, but rather injurious: but the spiritual without the carnal quickeneth thee. Of the third, which is only sacramental, the apostle speaks, when he says, He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body; that is to say, not distinguishing it from other food."†

The view taken by the celebrated Council of Trent on the bearing of John vi, on the eucharist, is not without interest. The learned divines of the Tridentine Synod well knew that they could not maintain the sacramental interpretation on the ground of a consent of fathers. In the course of the discussions which arose on the subject of giving the cup to the laity, this chapter was appealed to in order to show that our Lord speaks indifferently of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, and also of simply eating his flesh; and hence it was inferred that the latter virtually comprehends the former. But in opposition to this it was urged, that "many fathers understood those places in St. John, not of sacramental, but of a spiritual eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of his blood; and therefore the council should not indirectly sanction the opposite interpretation: Che in quel testo di S. Giovanni intendevasi da molti Padri non il mangiamento e il bevimento sacramentale, má lo spirituale della carne e del sangue di Christo: Sì che non conveniva al Concilio statuir obliquamente la contraria interpretazione."‡ Cardinal Seripando, who presided on that occasion, remarked, that there were two controversies connected with the discourse in that chapter of St. John; one, with the heretics, on this point,—whether the communion in both kinds was therein divinely commanded and made necessary for the salvation of all the faithful;—and the other, among the Catholics themselves, whether the discourse related to sacramental or spiritual communion:—that even allowing St. John to speak of the former, the inference that the cup was absolutely necessary to salvation was erroneous:—and that the proposed decree decided nothing in reference to the

* It is remarkable that the abbot has given the usual meaning of the original διὰ with an accusative, *propter*.

† Instructio Sacerdotis de tribus præcipuis mysteriis, cap. xii. Opera, Paris. 1719, vol. ii, col. 518.

‡ Istoria del Concilio di Trento, scritta dal Padre Sforza Pallavicino. Rom. 1657, cap. xi, lib. xvii, p. 408.

second of the two controversies. The "modest" cardinal, as Pallavicini calls him, should have stated the point somewhat differently; for the controversy was not, whether the cup is absolutely necessary to salvation, but whether the command to drink it is not as plain and obligatory as that to eat the flesh, and therefore the drinking of the one as certainly necessary to salvation as the eating of the other. After much consideration and discussion it was agreed, that in reference to our Lord's discourse, the decree should be amended by adding the words, "however among the various interpretations of the holy fathers and doctors it may have been understood; comunque frà le varie interpretazioni de' Santi Padri e de' Dottori s' intenda."* This passed by a majority of twenty-six; eighty-three voting in favor of the amendment, and fifty-seven against it. The minority did not maintain that the chapter related directly to the eucharist. They took the ground, "that it was not in character with the dignity of the council to say anything about the uncertainty of the meaning of so celebrated a portion of Scripture, and by express terms to leave it doubtful; and that it would be more decorous to adhere to the original form of the decree, and not to mention the second controversy at all. Allegavano questi, non esser dignità del Concilio, recando un capo sì celebre della Scrittura, toccar la dubbieta del senso, e insieme lasciarla con aperte parole in sospeso: Maggior decoro serbarsi nella prima forma, in cui non si menzionava la controversia."†

The correctness of this statement of the views and action of the Council of Trent is candidly admitted by Dr. Wiseman.‡ The learned Mr. Johnson, too, has certainly the best reason for saying, "It is evident that the Council of Trent did not believe the discourse in the sixth chapter of St. John to speak strictly of sacramental eating and drinking."§ But he is undoubtedly in an error, when he gives the following as an "especial" cause why they did not limit the meaning of the discourse to the sacramental exposition:— "Because it was apprehended, that if John sixth were taken as meant of the eucharist, it must follow, that it was absolutely necessary that the people must communicate in both kinds:" for the language of Cardinal Seripando, already quoted, expressly disclaims such an apprehension, inasmuch as it denies the inference to be well founded. It is indeed true, as the author remarks, that "our

* Istoria del Concilio di Trento, scritta dal Padre Sforza Pallavicino. Rom. 1657, cap. xi, lib. xvii, p. 409. † Ibid.

‡ Lectures on the Real Presence, Lect. v, pp. 163–165.

§ The Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar Unveiled. London, 1718, part ii, chap. ii, sec. iii, p. 151.

Saviour declares it to be altogether as dangerous to omit the drinking of his blood as the eating of his flesh;" and the correctness of the conclusion he draws as to the necessity of the cup, would be undeniable if the eucharist were the direct subject of the chapter. But that the divines of the council would allow this conclusion is quite another matter. The inference drawn from the indifferent use of the phrases *eating the flesh* and *drinking the blood*, and from the former alone, namely, that this comprehends the other, shows that they would not; and it is plain that the presiding cardinal expressly denies it. The result is irresistible, that the leading theologians of the Church of Rome, at that period, knew well that they could not claim a consent of fathers for the sacramental interpretation of John sixth.

A calm and candid attention to these particulars in the history of the interpretation of this chapter, and also in that of the Council of Trent, could not fail to be instructive to certain theologians, who, after assuming a consent of fathers in behalf of some favorite exposition, whereon some equally favorite dogma is thought to be sustained, ring the changes on their no less favorite, but no less ideal, catholicity. We limit the term *ideal* to that spurious catholicity which takes it for granted, that there is a regular, uniform stream of concurrent exposition running down from the apostolic times to the middle ages. A catholicity in the great and leading doctrines of the gospel, and in the facts and institutions which serve to develop and prove them, we delight to recognize and avow. It brings out the church of Christ as the glorious witness of God's truth, "the pillar and ground" of the faith, against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail." It sets up "the standard for the nations," and thus publicly calls them to flock to the banner of that mighty Conqueror whose "rest shall be glorious." It kindles on the shore of the ever-troubled ocean of mistiness and doubt that lofty beacon-light, which, supplied with the holy oil of the sanctuary, shall never go out, but burn, and flame, and blaze, in its own celestial splendor, until its divine warmth and illumination shall have dissipated error, and it shall have animated and attracted to itself all the tempest-tossed and perishing. But it is plain to every considerate person, that this catholicity must in the very nature of things be general. With the present constitution of the human mind, and the necessary diversity of education and circumstances, it would require a constant miracle to be otherwise. And a patient examination of authorities will show any one who will take the trouble to look for himself, that what *à priori* might be expected, is the real historical truth. On innumerable passages of the Bible the interpretations

of the fathers vary as much as those of modern times. Indeed, among the several instructive results of a careful study of the fathers, we consider it not the least, that it shows a wide diversity of opinion on many topics, highly important though not essential to the gospel scheme, to have been allowed to prevail without disturbing the harmony of the church. Herein we plainly see the true principle of toleration; and in this view, as well as in some others, the boasting self-sufficiency of the nineteenth century may profitably take a lesson from the modesty of the first three.

It is idle to talk of a universal consent of the church in the interpretation of Scripture, any further than in a general and popular way, so as to comprehend merely fundamental doctrines. "I see plainly and with mine own eyes," says the immortal Chillingworth, "that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age."* This is no mere flourish of rhetoric. It is the result of long-continued and patient investigation, the solitary labor of which, the busy, bustling, go-ahead divines of the present day have no adequate conception of. It may be ridiculed; that needs neither knowledge nor study: it may be sneered at; that requires only impudence: it may be denied; that calls for nothing but hardihood. But to prove its untruth,—ah! *hic labor, hoc opus est;* and this we are well assured is too sudorific an exercise to be undertaken.

In truth, however the *εκτρώματα θεολόγα* may talk about this matter, the thoughtful, serious, well-trained theologian, of whatever creed, will hardly deny the correctness of our position. *Ex uno disce omnes.* Even Mochler, who has contrived to throw a sort of charm over several of the errors of Popery, and, thus attired, to exhibit them in favorable contrast with his caricature delineation of Protestantism, is candid enough to acknowledge, that Catholic interpretation does not extend beyond general topics. "*The interpretation of the church does not descend to the details* which must claim the attention of the scientific exegetist.† Thus, for example, it does not hold it for a duty, nor include it in the compass of its rights, to determine when, by whom, and for what object the Book of Job was written, or what particular inducement engaged St.

* Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation, chap. vi, sec. 56. Works, ninth ed. Lon. fol. 1727, p. 271.

† The translator might have employed the simple word *expositor.*

John to publish his Gospel, or the apostle Paul to address an Epistle to the Romans. *As little doth the church explain particular words and verses, their bearings one on the other, or the connection existing between larger portions of a sacred book.* In short, the domain of her interpretation extends only to doctrines of faith and morals."—"Whoever takes the pains to study the writings of the holy fathers, may without much penetration discover, that *while agreeing perfectly on all ecclesiastical dogmas,*(!)* they yet *expatiate most variously* on the doctrines of Christian faith and morality. The *mode* and *form* most strikingly evince the individuality of each writer." "Except in the explanation of a very few classical passages,† *we know not where we shall meet with a general uniformity of Scriptural interpretation among the fathers, further than that* ALL DEDUCE FROM THE SACRED WRITINGS *the same doctrines of faith and morality.* More extensive philological acquirements, and the more abundant aids of every kind which modern times furnish, enable us, without in the least degree deviating from the unanimous interpretation of the fathers, to explain many things in a better and more solid manner than they did."‡ Better and in a more solid manner: no intelligent reader will entertain the least doubt of this.

After quotations from the primitive tomes, the essayist proceeds to present a splendid array of more modern authorities in favor of the anti-sacramental interpretation. Among which, not to mention the German reformers, stand the names of Whitby, Hammond, Beveridge, and even of some eminent critics in the Papal communion itself, as Erasmus, James Capel, and Cameron. We must pass them all by, however, and content ourselves with a small portion of that which he has produced from the writings of Archbishop Cranmer; "to which great and good man few divines of any age are comparable for acquaintance with patristical and scholastic theology, as well as for careful study of the Scriptures themselves, and whose representations of the views of the early writers of the church, therefore, merit very particular attention."

* For example, Dr. Moehler, that of the true time of keeping Easter, the "perfect agreement" in which is illustrated by the *controversy* in the second century between Victor of Rome and the eastern bishops; also, on the validity of heretical baptism, which gave rise to the *disputes* between Stephen of Rome and St. Cyprian of Carthage in the third!!

† That is, such as have a direct bearing on the subject to be proved or illustrated.

‡ Symbolism, by JOHN ADAM MOEHLER, D. D., New-York, 1844, pp. 367, 369, 372, 373.

In arguing against Dr. Richard Smyth, who alledged the sixth of John in defense of transubstantiation, Cranmer says:—

"There can be nothing more manifest than that, in this place, Christ spake not of the sacrament of his flesh, but of his very flesh. And that, as well for that the sacrament was not yet instituted, as also that Christ said not in the future tense, 'The bread which I will give *shall be* my flesh,' but in the present tense, 'The bread which I will give *is* my flesh;' which sacramental bread was neither then his flesh, nor was then instituted for a sacrament, nor was afterward given to death for the life of the world.

"But as Christ, when he said unto the woman of Samaria, 'The water which I will give shall spring into everlasting life,' he meant it neither of material water nor of the accidents of water, but of the Holy Ghost, which is the heavenly fountain that springeth unto everlasting life; so likewise, when he said, 'The bread which I will give is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world,' he meant it neither of the material bread, neither of the accidents of bread, but of his own flesh; which, although of itself it availeth nothing, yet being in unity of person joined to his divinity, it is the same heavenly bread which he gave to death upon the cross for the life of the world."

"But your understanding of the sixth chapter of John is such as was never uttered of any man before your time, and as declareth you to be utterly ignorant of God's mysteries. For who ever said or taught before this time, that the sacrament was the cause why Christ said, If we eat not the flesh of the Son of man, we have no life in us? The spiritual eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood by faith, by digesting his death in our minds as our only price, and ransom, and redemption from eternal damnation, is the cause wherefore Christ said, that if we eat not his flesh and drink not his blood, we have no life in us; and if we eat his flesh and drink his blood, we have everlasting life. And if Christ had never ordained this sacrament, yet should we have eaten his flesh and drunken his blood, and have had thereby everlasting life, as all the faithful did before it was ordained, and do daily when they receive not the sacrament. And so did the holy men that wandered in the wilderness, and in all their lifetime very seldom received the sacrament, and many holy martyrs, either exiled or kept in prison, did daily feed of the food of Christ's body, and drank daily the blood which sprang out of his side, (or else they could not have had everlasting life, as Christ himself said in the Gospel of St. John,) and yet they were not suffered, with other Christian people, to have the use of the sacrament."—

ART. III.—*A Drama of Exile: and other Poems.* By ELIZABETH B. BARRETT. 2 vols. New-York: Henry G. Langley. 1845.

THERE are many who regard the chief end of poetry to be amusement or recreation. They think it well enough, in the intermissions of life's toil, to spend a few leisure moments in listening to the soft melody and the harmonious numbers of the poet's song. Now this is a most false and lamentably low estimate of the design and use of poetry. It is true, there are songs of a nature peculiarly fitted for the hour of the soul's repose from action; such as have magic power

"To quiet the restless pulse of care."

But poetry has a higher object than this. It is the language of the soul's loftiest aspirations and its deepest feelings. It has power to nerve the warrior's heart to action in the great moral, as of old it did in the physical, strife; to support us when the agony of suffering is heaviest, and to cheer and elevate our spirits when life's mysteries envelop us in their darkest gloom. Nor is its ideal false. We all need that heart-faith in the ideal to which poetry lends strong aid. Every pure ideal of the soul is but a more distant real. Our brightest imaginings of it cannot deceive us. If earth never realizes what it calls our dreams, yet shall they all have a sure fulfillment in that better land, the extent of whose glories "it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive." No: the imagination is *not* "a fraud upon the reason;" but the winged messenger of the soul, that in its flight stretches far out over the ocean of mystery, and brings from beyond a promise and assurance, bright, though but a symbol, of the future.

Greatly has man suffered from the separation of æsthetics and theology. The true and the beautiful are one. "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder." Let poetry join herself to Christianity, and then shall she receive a depth, a sublimity, and a truth she never knew before; while she lends her own loveliness and beauty to Christianity. It is one of the most encouraging signs of the age, to find how much more *earnest* our literature, and especially our poetry, is becoming. Our best poets no longer content themselves with the stirring songs of battles; the old legends of chivalry; the oft-told tale of "lady won in courtly bower;" or the mere description of the outward beauties of nature;—but take *man* as their theme, and from the daily struggles, joys, sorrows, and hopes of life derive their inspiration. Humanity is the poet's sub-

ject. Christianity has gradually infused itself into our literature, and given it a deeper spiritualism.

At the very head of this class of spiritual poets we should place Elizabeth Barrett. There are no two qualities more manifest in her than *intensity*, and *deep religious feeling*. One of the most gifted of our American writers calls her the "*strongest* woman that has yet written." We not only agree with this praise, but think *intensity* the fitter word to characterize her power; and esteem her without a rival in this quality among our living poets of either sex. The impress of Christianity is on almost every piece in the volumes before us; while the main poem is on a mighty theme, akin to that for which, in solemn prayer, Milton invoked the inspiration of the heavenly muse. It is most eminently true of Miss Barrett, as evinced in all her works, that

> —"Sion hill
> Delights her most, and Siloa's brook that flow'd
> Fast by the oracle of God."

She is the most subjective and personal of our poets; and at the same time has been but recently known at all beyond the immediate circle of her friends. As she says herself, her poetry is "the completest expression of her being;" and it is therefore necessary to a full enjoyment of it, that we should know something of her history. Fortunately, in addition to what we can learn from her preface and from her poems, Mr. Horne, in his "Spirit of the Age," has furnished us with the main facts of her life. And, certainly, had her poems no other interest, we should hope to enlist the reader's sympathy for them, when we state that they are the productions of one, confined for years by a hopeless sickness to her solitary chamber, scarcely seen by any but her own family, and compelled often to pass days, and even weeks, in almost total darkness. Those who have themselves enjoyed, or perhaps still better, have imparted to some poor invalid the holy consolation and heroic cheer of Miss Martineau's "Life in a Sick Room," will be interested to know that the friend to whom the letters are addressed is one who was then her companion in affliction, and, unlike her, seems destined yet to pass long years in the vale of sorrow,—Miss Barrett. Yet from her sick-room she has sent forth her poems, written with no feebleness of spirit, but with a strength to which suffering seems to have lent a stimulus,—though she herself tells us, "If this art of poetry had been a less earnest object to me, it must have dropped from exhausted hands before this day." Of the variety and extent of her acquirements, authorities concur in saying that

she is one of the most learned and accomplished scholars among the writers of England; having a thorough knowledge of Greek, even to the mastering of the immortal Plato; a critical knowledge of the oriental languages, necessary to a thorough reading of the Bible in its original tongues; and at the same time "as wide and diffuse acquaintance with literature, that of the present day inclusive, as any living individual." It is with such varied attainments and extensive culture, with the influence of suffering in developing her genius and character, sanctified by the deepest religious faith, that she has devoted herself with unwearied labor to those poetical productions which, at the same time, have consoled her in her own affliction and elevated her thoughts above the body's sufferings; while they have secured her a loving memory and an affectionate gratitude among a circle of friends daily increasing in number, and established a poetic reputation which time will largely increase.

With the exception of a few miscellaneous articles, translations, etc., in various periodicals, her first publication was entitled, "*The Seraphim, and other Poems;*" and was issued in 1838. Of this there has been no American edition. Her other work, which we propose to notice, was given to the American public,—for whom, she says, "I have felt a love and admiration as long as I have felt proud of being an Englishwoman, and almost as long as I have loved poetry itself,"—some little time in anticipation of its publication in England.

The "Drama of Exile" is a poem of about one hundred and twenty pages: the foundation being blank verse, interspersed with chants and choruses of irregular metres. The object of the work, as stated by herself, is, "the new and strange experience of the fallen humanity, as it went forth from Paradise: with a peculiar reference to Eve's allotted grief, which, considering that self-sacrifice belonged to her womanhood, and the consciousness of being the organ of the fall, to her offense,—appeared to me imperfectly apprehended hitherto, and more expressible by a woman than a man." The time occupied is the twilight after their expulsion from Eden; and the action of the drama is not too long for this space, when we consider that we have scientific reasons for believing twilight before the flood to have been longer than at present; besides, Miss Barrett's poetic excuse, that she can "never, for her part, believe in an Eden without the longest of purple twilights." The scene commences where Milton closes; when the guilty pair

> —"hand in hand with wand'ring steps and slow,
> Through Eden took their solitary way."

They are seen in the distance, flying along from the sword-glare which shut them for ever out of Paradise, and seeking the wilderness before them. Lucifer opens the poem with a taunt on Gabriel, the keeper of the gate. Gabriel bids him depart. Lucifer claims the earth for his; and exclaims,

"Here's a brave earth to sin and suffer on!
It holds fast still—it cracks not under curse:
It holds like mine immortal. Presently
We'll sow it thick enough with graves as green
Or greener, certes, than its knowledge tree.
* * * * The red sign
Burnt on my forehead, which you taunt me with,
Is God's sign that it bows not unto God:
The potter's mark upon his work, to show
It rings well to the striker. I and the earth
Can bear more curse.

Gabriel. O miserable earth!
O ruined angel!

Lucifer. Well! and if it be,
I CHOSE this ruin: I elected it
Of my will, not of service. What I do,
I do volitient, not obedient."

The reply of Gabriel to the boasted independence of Satan, is, for its metaphysical acumen, (though Miss Barrett has generally chosen more to display feeling than logic,) worthy of Milton—we had almost said worthy of the personage who uses it.

"Spirit of scorn!
I might say, of unreason! I might say,
That who despairs, acts; that who acts, connives
With God's relations set in time and space;
That who elects, assumes a something good
Which God made possible; that who lives, obeys
The law of a Life-maker."

At length Gabriel asks Lucifer whether he knows aught of the future of mankind; he replies,

"Only as much as this:
That evil will increase and multiply
Without a benediction.

Gabriel. Nothing more!

Lucifer. Why so the angels taunt! What should be more?

Gabriel. God is more.

Lucifer. Proving what?

Gabriel. That he is God,
And capable of saving."

Unheeding this intimation of God's gracious providence, Satan at length goes his way, leaving this terrible threat behind him:

> —"I assert my will.
> And peradventure in the after years,
> When thoughtful men bend slow their spacious brows
> Upon the storm and strife seen everywhere
> To ruffle their smooth manhood, and break up
> With lurid lights of intermittent hope
> Their human fear and wrong,—they may discern
> The heart of a lost angel in the earth."

Now is heard the "chorus of Eden spirits;" and the "spirit of the trees," the "river-spirits," the "bird-spirits," and the "flower-spirits," chant their mournful, plaintive farewell, and the awful "never-more," to the hearts of the exiles. This imbodiment of the feelings suggested to Adam and Eve by the thought of the joys of nature left for ever behind in Paradise, and its expression in the spirits' voices is most exquisitely beautiful and pathetic; while it is full of poetic power.

Adam and Eve are now first introduced as pausing a moment in their flight as they reach the extremity of the sword-glare. Here Eve bitterly bewails her transgression, and especially reproaches herself as the cause of the curse to Adam. She beseeches him to put her straight away and seek God's mercy thereby;—"thy wrath against the sinner giving proof of inward abrogation of the sin." Adam replies, that he is "deepest in the guilt, if last in the transgression;" having also sinned against the "last best gift of God," his Eve; and comforts her, declaring it is God's will they should bear the curse together. Eve recovers her strength, and tells him,

> "Because I comprehend
> This human love, I shall not be afraid
> Of any human death."

Yet she now confesses that all day long in their desolate journey this prayer had trembled on her lips:

> "O Lord God!
> ('Twas so I prayed) I ask Thee by my sin,
> And by thy curse, and by thy blameless heavens,
> Make dreadful haste to hide me from thy face,
> And from the face of my beloved here,
> For whom I am no helpmate, quick away
> Into the new dark mystery of death!
> I will lie still there; I will make no plaint;
> I will not sigh, nor sob, nor speak a word,
> Nor struggle to come back beneath the sun,

Where peradventure I might sin anew
Against thy mercy and his pleasure. Death,
O death, whate'er it be, is good enough
For such as I.—For Adam—there's no voice,
Shall ever say again, in heaven or earth,
It is not good for him to be alone.
Adam. And was it good for such a prayer to pass
My unkind Eve, betwixt our mutual lives?
If I am *exiled*, must I be *bereaved?*"

Eve confesses that "'twas an ill prayer; it shall be prayed no more;" and taking courage, the woman's heart within made strong by Adam's love, she declares,

"Since I was the first
In the transgression, with a steady foot
I will be first to tread from this sword-glare
Into the outer darkness of the waste;—
And thus I do it."

As they go on, a faint song of the "invisible angels," the love-angels that ministered to them in Paradise, breathes a sad lament; but yet with tender pity assures them, that though "this pure door of opal God hath shut between us," that still,

"Yet across the doorway,
Past the silence reaching,
Farewells evermore may,
Blessing in the teaching,
Glide from us to you."

As the tones of the angels die away, Satan meets Adam and Eve. Most beautifully, with a single stroke of the pen, has Miss Barrett here delineated the trusting, confiding nature of woman, and her instinctive disposition, since she was first overcome, to ever cling closer to man in the hour of danger. Eve calls to Adam,

"Adam! hold
My right hand strongly. It is Lucifer—
And we have love to lose."

Lucifer proceeds to taunt them; his first salutation is,

"Now may all fruits be pleasant to thy lips,
Beautiful Eve! The times have somewhat changed
Since thou and I had talk beneath a tree;
Albeit ye are not gods yet."

It is here that we are almost inclined to place the greatest power of the drama; in this picture of Satan coming to taunt the guilty

world bears on their account. This reproach is full of terrible power. One of the spirits represents the animals, and the other nature; and from them both there comes a "groan of the whole creation," awful in its solemn accusation. It is a most forcible conception of the bitter feelings of remorse which Adam and Eve must have experienced, when they looked abroad on the world so lately filled with God's best blessings everywhere, and saw all now cursed; and felt, bitterest of all, that it was *for their sake.* No fancy picture is this representation of the reproachful voice of the world; deeply must it have entered the soul of the exiles. Miss Barrett's design here is highly poetical, for it has the poetry of truth; while its execution is powerful. Their wail gradually changes to bitter invective and threats. How eloquent is their voice—here is the eloquence of *sorrow:*

"*First Spirit.* I feel your steps, O wandering sinners, strike
A sense of death to me, and undug graves!
The heart of earth, once calm, is trembling, like
The ragged foam along the ocean-waves:
The restless earthquakes rock against each other;—
The elements moan 'round me—"Mother, mother"—
And I wail!

Second Spirit. I wail, I wail! I shriek in the assault
Of undeserved perdition, sorely wounded!
My nightingales sang sweet without a fault,
My gentle leopards innocently bounded;
We were obedient—what is this convulses
Our blameless life with pangs and fever pulses?
And I wail!"

Now changed into defiance, here is the eloquence of their *scorn.*

"*First Spirit.* And we scorn you! * * *
And the elements shall boldly
All your dust to dust constrain;
Unresistedly and coldly,
I will smite you with my rain!
From the slowest of my frosts is no receding.

Second Spirit. And my little worm, appointed
To assume a royal part,
He shall reign, crowned and anointed
O'er the noble human heart."

No wonder the agony of such reproaches was terrible; and that Eve, feeling her "punishment greater than she could bear," should, after in vain beseeching them to be gentler, exclaim,

"I choose God's thunder and his angels' swords
To die by, Adam, rather than such words."

But the violence of the earth-spirits at length rouses up the human passions of Adam, and he says to them,

"Do ye scorn us? Back your scorn
Toward your faces gray and lorn
As the wind drives back the rain,
Thus I drive with passion strife.
* * * * *
By my free will that chose sin,
By mine agony within
Round the passage of the fire;
By the pinings which disclose
That my native soul is higher
Than what it chose,—
We are yet too high, O spirits, for your disdain."

Still the spirits claim their triumph:

"We triumph—triumph greatly,
When ye lie beneath the sward!
There my lily shall grow stately,
Though ye answer not a word."

Adam at length charges them into silence:

"Down to obedience—I am king of you!"

But the spirits laugh him to scorn, and mock him yet more bitterly:

"Ha, ha! Thou art king!
With a sin for a crown,
And a soul undone."—

At last, wearied and exhausted with these reproaches, and with the words of Lucifer, who, while the spirits were speaking, comes again and adds another pang to their suffering, scorning their "petty griefs," Adam makes his appeal to God and his *power*. Eve appeals to his *pity;* and prays for a token of the promised seed; for now

"My soul is bruised before the serpent's head."

Soon CHRIST appears in a vision, and stills the rebellious voice of creation. He shows the earth-spirits man's supremacy though fallen, and bids them serve him yet:

"Be ye to man as angels be to God,
Servants in pleasure, singers of delight,
Suggesters to his soul of higher things
Than any of your highest. So at last,
He shall look round on you, with lids too straight
To hold the grateful tears, and thank you well.
* * * * *
Go serve him for such price."

Christ then commands Adam "to bless the woman, for it is thine office." Thus commissioned, Adam foretells to her the future, with its sufferings, its joys, and its promises; and exclaims,

"—Henceforward, woman, rise
To thy peculiar and best altitudes
Of doing good and of enduring ill,—
Of comforting for ill, and teaching good,
And reconciling all that ill and good
Unto the patience of a constant hope,—
Rise with thy daughters! If sin came by thee,
And by sin, death,—the ransom—righteousness,
The heavenly life and compensative rest
Shall come by means of thee. If wo by thee
Had issue to the world, thou shalt go forth
An angel of the wo thou didst achieve;
Found acceptable to the world instead
Of others of that name, of whose bright steps
Thy deed stripped bare the hills. Be satisfied;
Something thou hast to bear through womanhood—
Peculiar suffering answering to the sin;
Some pang paid down for each new human life;
Some weariness in guarding such a life—
Some coldness from the guarded; some mistrust
From those thou hast too well served; from those beloved
Too loyally, some treason; feebleness
Within thy heart, and cruelty without;
And pressures of an alien tyranny,
With its dynastic reasons of larger bones
And stronger sinews. But, go to! thy love
Shall chant itself its own beatitudes,
After its own life-working. A child's kiss,
Set on thy sighing lips, shall make thee glad:
A poor man, served by thee, shall make thee rich;
An old man, helped by thee, shall make thee strong;
Thou shalt be served thyself by every sense
Of service which thou renderest. Such a crown
I set upon thy head,—Christ witnessing
With looks of prompting love—to keep thee clear
Of all reproach against the sin foregone
From all the generations which succeed."

This is a most vivid and affecting picture of woman's mission on earth. Though given here by Adam, none but a *woman* could have been its author;—from the deep experiences and the inmost records of her heart, alone, could it have proceeded Eve's reply is full of angelic, patient submission:

"I accept
For me and my daughters this high part

Which lowly shall be counted. Noble work
Shall hold me in the place of garden rest:
And in the place of Eden's lost delight,
Worthy endurance of permitted pain;
While on my longest patience there shall wait
Death's speechless angel, smiling in the east
Whence cometh the cold wind. I bow myself
Humbly henceforward on the ill I did,
That humbleness may keep it in the shade."

Christ is now gradually transfigured before them into humanity, and gives them the promise of his future coming as their Saviour, and of his suffering for their sake on earth. As he leaves them he gives a parting blessing for their support:

"—Henceforth in my name
Take courage, O thou woman,—man, take hope!
Your graves shall be as smooth as Eden's sward,
Beneath the steps of your prospective thoughts;
And one step past them, a new Eden-gate
Shall open on a hinge of harmony,
And let you through to mercy. Ye shall fall
No more, within that Eden, nor pass out
Any more from it. In which hope, move on,
First sinners and first mourners. Live and love,—
Doing both nobly, because lowlily;
Live and work, strongly,—because patiently!"

The earth-spirits now, obeying the Saviour's voice, renew to man their "homage-oath once broken," and ask his forgiveness; promising instead of scorn and injury, gentleness, kindness, and solace:

"Ye shall find us tender nurses
To your weariness of nature;
And our hands shall stroke the curses
Dreary furrows from the creature."

There is then a final vision of the last taming and conquering of the "wild horse of death," by the Saviour; it is full of terrible strength and of glorious triumph: but we have no room for extracts.

Thus soothed by nature's influences and harmony again, and sustained by the holy promises of Christ, the agony of sorrow is lifted from the exiles' hearts; and with "sadness that is calm, not gloom," they commence their life-pilgrimage. The chorus of the "invisible angels" attends them, and the last strain cheers them with sweet consolation.

"L. E. L.'s LAST QUESTION" is a beautiful poem founded on an expression in one of her last writings sent home:—"*Do you think of me as I think of you?*" The closing turn of the sentiment, by which the *Saviour* is represented as making this appeal to each one of us, is peculiarly touching. "CROWNED AND BURIED" is a most magnificent picture of Napoleon's grandeur in life, and of his grave in death; and at the same time is most just and discriminating in its view of his character.

> "I do not praise this man; the man was flawed
> For Adam—much more, Christ!—* *
> * * * But since he had
> *The genius to be loved*, why let him have
> The justice to be honored in his grave."

As a specimen of *intensity of feeling*, we know nothing to surpass the following from the "CRY OF THE HUMAN." Before such love as this, even the most hallowed phrases of earthly affection seem cold and lifeless. After reading what follows, one may well feel that the solemnity of our marriage service can never again impress us as it was wont with its promise of life-long faithfulness.

> "We sit together, with the skies,
> The steadfast skies, above us:
> We look into each other's eyes,—
> 'And how long will you love us?'—
> The eyes grew dim with prophecy,
> The voices, low and breathless—
> 'Till death us part'—*O words, to be*
> *Our best for love the deathless!*
> Be pitiful, dear God!"

After all, however, we think our copy of Miss Barrett will testify that the SONNETS are our favorites, by exhibiting marks of most frequent reading. We would especially advise all readers to begin with these, rather than undertake the "Drama" at first. They are the most *personal* of all her poetry. Though deeply tinged with the coloring of her suffering life, they are full of Christian consolation and heroism. It has been well said of a poet whose admirers claim for him the highest place among his contemporaries, Alfred Tennyson, that "he comes *out of himself* to sing a poem, and goes back again: or rather sends his song out from his shadow under the leaf, as other nightingales do; and refuses to be expansive to his public, opening his heart on the hinges of music." In this characteristic, which we think belongs to no *true* poet, Miss Barrett is precisely his opposite; and in these Sonnets, particularly,

she has indeed given us her "heart and life in them." They could never have been written except by one made strong through suffering by the sanctifying influences of exalted, ardent, Christian faith. Their mere titles will afford some idea of their nature:—"*Grief*," "*Tears*," "*Substitution*," "*Comfort*," "*The Look*,' (Christ's on Peter,) "*Futurity*," "*The Soul's Expression*," "*A Thought for a Lonely Death-Bed*," etc. Our choice of the few of these we can give here as specimens has wavered and vascillated so much, nearly as much as a mother's would if called to select from her children, that we almost let chance determine.

"TEARS.

Thank God, bless God, all ye who suffer not
More grief than ye can weep for. That is well—
That is light grieving! lighter, none befell,
Since Adam forfeited the primal lot.
Tears! What are tears? The babe weeps in its cot,
The mother singing: at her marriage bell,
The bride weeps: and before the oracle
Of high-faned hills, the poet hath forgot
That moisture on his cheeks. Commend the grace,
Mourners, who weep! Albeit, as some have done,
Ye grope tear-blinded, in a desert place,
And touch but tombs,—look up! Those tears will run
Soon, in long rivers, down the lifted face,
And leave the vision clear for stars and sun.

"COMFORT.

Speak low to me, my Saviour, low and sweet
From out the hallelujahs, sweet and low,
Lest I should fear and fall, and miss thee so
Who art not missed by any that entreat.
Speak to me as to Mary at thy feet—
And if no precious gums my hands bestow,
Let my tears drop like amber—while I go
In reach of thy divinest voice complete
In humanest affection—thus, in sooth,
To lose the sense of losing! As a child,
Whose song-bird seeks the wood for evermore,
Is sung to in its stead by mother's mouth;
Till, sinking on her breast, love-reconciled,
He sleeps the faster that he wept before."

Lowell well says, "The first voice that is heard after the reading of good poetry comes ordinarily from the shallowest heart in the company." Such poetry as the above we cannot praise. It stirs "thoughts that lie too deep."

We have aimed not so much to eulogize Miss Barrett, as to let her speak for herself. We have also purposely forborne to notice any faults of style or otherwise, because we are a firm believer in the propriety of Coleridge's maxim:—"Never admit the faults of a work to persons incapable of appreciating its beauties:" and as we think the public yet insensible to the merits of these poems, we deem it not only the most pleasant, but the most appropriate work of the critic to call attention to their beauties. If we have succeeded in introducing her to the heart of one loving friend, who will give her the same warm homage of grateful tears she has already won from others; better still, if we have introduced her to a sister in suffering, who may from her receive consolation, and learn better the holy lessons of the sick-room; we shall have been more than abundantly repaid.

We hope the publishers will feel themselves justified in soon giving us an American edition of the "*Seraphim*," also; for, although on the whole these volumes exhibit greater maturity of poetic power than the earlier work, yet there are in it a few pieces that can hardly be surpassed. P.

Middletown, Conn.

ART. IV.—1. *General Catalogue of Books, Tracts, &c.* New-York: Lane & Tippett.

2. *Fifth Annual Report of the Sunday-School Union of the M. E. Church. Also an arranged Catalogue of the Sunday-School Publications and Tracts.* New-York: Lane & Tippett.

3. *Twenty-First Annual Report of the American Sunday-School Union, for establishing Sunday-Schools, and circulating Religious Publications.* Philadelphia: published by the Society.

4. *Twentieth Annual Report of the American Tract Society; presented at New-York, May 7, 1845; showing the Successful Results of the Society's Labors in our own and Foreign and Pagan Lands. With Lists of Auxiliaries, Directors, and Members for Life, Publications, &c.* New-York: D. Fanshaw.

5. *Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. of America. Presented to the General Assembly, May, 1845.* Phila.: Joseph P. Engles.

EVERY religious denomination has its literature, and we have ours. The history of our literature dates with the commencement of our history as a Christian sect. Mr. Wesley had no sooner found himself at the head of a growing religious community, than he began

to provide for their intellectual and moral cultivation all the means which his learning and piety could command. He not only preached the word, and employed helpers in this work, but commenced the publication of books and tracts upon all the important topics, the understanding of which was necessary to enlighten the piety of the people, and give them weight in society. His object was to make knowledge cheap, and to bring down to the common people the means of intellectual and moral cultivation which were by no means general among that class. He wrote and published much original matter; and reviewed, corrected, and abridged a great number of works which were scarce and difficult of access. His miscellaneous works, and his Christian Library, show a zeal and diligence in furnishing reading for the people, in the providence of God committed to his charge, which are, perhaps, without a parallel. His works, original and selected, embrace a great variety of themes, and cover almost the whole field in divinity, history, poetry, philosophy, grammar, medicine, &c. Some of his tracts and abridgments are now of no great value—particularly those upon philosophical, scientific, and speculative subjects—as they are superseded by such as are more complete, and include modern discoveries and improvements. But that they were admirably suited to the wants of the people for whom they were provided, and rendered essential service to the cause of general improvement, no one will deny.

It is not our object to criticise these publications, or to speak of their merits, but merely to allude to them as evidence that our eminent founder felt and acted upon the conviction, that "it is not good that the soul should be without knowledge;" and that he strenuously exerted himself to make the Methodists an intelligent, as well as a pious, people, and that he encouraged the cultivation of letters among them to the greatest possible extent.

The literature of the denomination has continued to expand with the increase of our numbers and resources. The want has soon brought on the supply; so that though we have become a numerous and influential people on both sides of the Atlantic, we have not suffered from a paucity of authors qualified to supply us with all that has been desirable in the form of denominational literature. Several men of learning and literary taste commenced their career under Mr. Wesley's eye, and ultimately added the productions of their pens to the stock of books which he himself had published. And down to the present time the Methodists have produced their fair proportion of good and useful authors. That there have been among them many eminent scholars and

critics who have contributed to the stock of general literature, we do not assert; though there are a few such of whom we should not be ashamed to speak. But that we have never wanted for writers who have been able to write creditably and usefully, and that our denominational literature has kept pace with the progress of the denomination, is what we maintain; and, that we have always had authors who would not suffer by a comparison with those of other denominations of Christians. In these remarks we refer to the Methodists generally, embracing those in both Europe and America.

Numbers one and two, at the head of this article, embrace the publications of our Book Room in this country, and though a perfect analysis of them is not at this time intended, we wish to notice some general features which they present.

The Sunday-School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church is but an infant institution. We have in the Report an account of two interesting anniversaries, and portions of the correspondence with the society. The latter shows in a clear and strong light the destitution of certain sections of our work, as to the means of successfully prosecuting the business of Sunday-school instruction. The "applications for aid" are constantly becoming more numerous and pressing. The receipts of the treasury have, as yet, been comparatively small; but it is to be hoped that the facts and arguments set forth in the Report will have a tendency to awaken an interest upon the subject, and to call forth something like adequate efforts to supply our destitute schools with books.

The catalogue of Sunday-school books shows a considerable advance in the number and variety of our Sunday-School publications, thirty-nine new books having been added to the list under the management of our present diligent and enterprising editor. We think this department will soon fully meet the wants of our growing Sunday-school interest throughout the country.

The catalogue of tracts shows that we have a tolerable supply of this kind of cheap literature. The number of tracts, and the variety of topics of which they treat, are respectable, and will continue to increase. These tracts, bound, constitute a choice family library which every Methodist family would do well to possess.

A classification and synopsis of the catalogue are given as follows:—

"We are prepared to furnish our tracts, in packages, according to the classification, at the following prices, each package being neatly enveloped in a cover, upon which the numbers and titles of the several tracts are printed:—

I. Miscellaneous Tracts, 664 pp., in two packages, 22 cents each.
II. Tracts Awakening and Inviting, 296 pp., 20 cents.
III. Tracts on Christian Graces and Duties, 348 pp., 23 cents.
IV. Doctrinal and Controversial:
A { 1 Divinity of Christ and Character of God, / 2 Election, Reprobation, and Perseverance, / 3 Baptism and Lord's Supper, } 453 pp., 30 cts.
B { 4 Church Organization, / 5 Popular Errors, / 6 Repentance, Faith, and Holiness, } 440 pp., 30 cts.
V. Narratives, 642 pp., in two packages, 21 cents each.
VI. Temptations and Vices, 236 pp., 15 cents.
VII. The Sabbath and Sunday Schools, 92 pp., 6 cents.
VIII. Advice and Duties, 264 pp., 17 cents.
IX–X. On the Circulation of Tracts and on Education, 78 pp., 5 cts.
XI. For Seamen, 76 pp., 5 cents.
XII. On Missions, 76 pp., 5 cents.
XIII. On Infidelity, 112 pp., 7 cents.
XIV. Ten choice Sermons of Mr. Wesley, 152 pp., 10 cents.

A complete set of our tracts, amounting to nearly four thousand pages, either put up in numerical order, or distributed in packages, as above, will be furnished for $2.50. They may also be had, neatly bound in volumes, at $5.25."—*Fifth Annual Report of S. S. Union of the M. E. Church*, p. 37.

The general catalogue is mostly theological and miscellaneous. Our exegetical works are ample and of acknowledged merit; though there seem to be strong indications of a call for a popular commentary somewhat of the class of Barnes' Notes. Such a work, ably and faithfully executed, would, doubtless, meet with a ready sale. We need also a small work upon Biblical exegesis for candidates for the ministry. As for didactic, polemical, pastoral, and practical divinity, our catalogue is exceedingly rich. A condensed system of theology for the use of candidates for the ministry seems to be a desideratum.

As for history we have something of that character; but we want a good history of the church. Our biographical department is well furnished. And if we may refer to the works of *our* authors which are published at other establishments, and constitute a portion of the general literature of the country, we can speak of "Travels in," "Observations upon," and "Sketches of," foreign countries, which would be creditable to any denomination. We only regret that the works of Fisk, Olin, Durbin, and Kidder, could not have been issued at our own press. But such is the commission allowed by order of the General Conference, and which the agents have no power to modify, that authors have not the en-

couragement at our establishment that they meet with elsewhere. This we most deeply regret, and hope, for the credit of the establishment, if for no other reason, the next General Conference may take the matter into serious consideration, and if possible apply the appropriate remedy.

As to periodical literature, we have, perhaps, all the publications which are necessary. Besides the Christian Advocate and Journal of New-York, and the Western Christian Advocate of Cincinnati, we have several local weekly papers, ably edited and well sustained. The Quarterly Review is, we are happy to say, increasing its patronage, an evidence that it is both needed and appreciated. The Ladies' Repository, published at Cincinnati, is a monthly magazine ably edited and well sustained. The Sunday-School Advocate, according to the Report, now has a circulation of "fifty thousand copies, having increased forty thousand within the last eight months;" a sure evidence of its adaptation and usefulness. And the Missionary Advocate, a vehicle for missionary intelligence, is widely circulated and eagerly read by the lovers of the missionary cause throughout the land.

With this hasty sketch of the materials with which our literature is made up, and the departments it supplies, we shall proceed to the accomplishment of our principal object in this paper; and that is, to urge the importance of the circulation and reading of our excellent books. In doing this we shall first present some views upon reading in general.

The greatest provision which God has made for the illumination and expansion of the human mind, is *reading*. All we can learn by conversation and observation is comparatively little. Many important subjects can only be understood imperfectly, and many others cannot be understood at all, except through the medium of books. And how ample is this instrumentality of human improvement! It brings us into contact with the wisdom of all countries and of all past ages—through it we are able to listen to the instruction of philosophers, prophets, apostles, and of God himself, upon the most important topics. We hold communion not only with Socrates and Plato, Luther and Melancthon, Wesley and Fletcher, but with Paul, James, John, and even with Him who spake as never man spake. How we may best profit by this wonderful provision, is a question of no ordinary moment; and to its solution we propose in this article to direct a few remarks.

1. Our reading should be *select*.

There is much useless and injurious matter written and published, as well as that which is good and profitable. Consequently,

it is a dictate of common prudence to strive to separate the precious from the vile.

In doing this, we should, *first*, discard all those writings which are either useless or injurious. None will question the necessity of this course in relation to the latter class. Bad books, like other "evil communications, corrupt good manners." Contact with error and corruption, in the form of written discourse, is more dangerous than in any other form. Evil, stereotyped, as it is more permanent, so it is more potent, than when it takes the fugitive form of conversation or example. Hence, if considerations of safety require that we should shun bad society, much more do these considerations require that we should shun—even thrust from us with pious horror—all bad books.

But there are those who, though they fully concede all this, still plead for reading which is designed merely to amuse. We will admit that relaxation from severe toil of body and mind is necessary to the health of each—that severe study, long protracted, exhausts the energies of both the intellectual and physical systems. Mental and bodily relaxation is consequently a duty as much as a privilege. But we maintain that it is possible to turn even our moments of necessary relaxation to good account—to make them tributary to our mental and moral improvement. A want of proper discretion in this matter often results in the aggravation of evils we are striving to cure. As there are forms of bodily relaxation which enervate the physical system, and disqualify it for vigorous and effective labor, so there are modes of mental relaxation which unhinge the mind, and render it incompetent to all healthy functions.

So far as *mere* amusement is concerned, it may well be doubted whether we have time for it. If life is longer than is necessary for the accomplishment of its great ends, then may we squander away the surplus after having finished all we have to do. There is reading which is both amusing and improving. A sound discretion, and a proper sense of our accountability to God for the improvement of our precious time, will always direct us to this when we find it necessary to swing off from that severe mental and physical toil which, when long protracted, injuriously affects the nervous system. But we cannot give the least license to what is popularly called "light reading." Much of this is not only useless, but positively injurious. We refer particularly to the *popular novels of the day.*

We cannot occupy space to present our views at large upon this topic. After all we have heard said in favor of works of fiction, we must say, as a class, we protest against them. They unduly excite the sensibilities, and give them a preponderance over the reasoning

faculties. With the young, especially, the imagination needs to be curbed and disciplined. The excitement of fiction is too great for the susceptibility and ardor of the youthful mind, and its continued action results in a morbid sensibility. It is useless to urge here that there are many works of fiction which are of good moral tendency. It is the habits of thought and feeling which fiction begets which constitute the great mischief. No one in a sound condition of the moral faculties will plead for the profane and licentious productions of some of our popular novel-writers. They only plead for the better sort of novels—religious novels—or such at least as impart lessons of moral instruction.* And to this position in the

* Mrs. Sigourney says: "Works of imagination usually predominate in the libraries of young ladies. To condemn them in a mass, as has been sometimes done, is hardly just. Some of them are the productions of the finest minds, and abound with the purest sentiments. Yet discrimination, with regard to them, is exceedingly important, and such discrimination as a novice cannot exercise. The young should therefore ask guidance of an experienced and cultivated mind, and devote to this class of reading only a moderate portion of time, as to a recreation. Frequent and long indulgence in it creates disgust at the patient acquisition of solid learning, as compound and poignant dishes destroy a relish for plain and healthful food. It forms habits of desultory thought, and uproots mental discipline. It makes it an object not to *read and remember*, but to *read and be amused*. So the fanciful palate is pleased, and the imagination pampered, while the hungering judgment, to borrow Cowper's simile, 'looks up and is not fed.' Among works of this description, those which are denominated novels of deep and stirring interest are calculated to heighten in the young mind those powers which need no excitement. In the language of Mrs. Hannah More,—

'They add fresh strength to what before was strong.'

Habits of excursive fancy, and illusive views of life, are not salutary in their influence on those whose business it is to reason, and to act; to bear, and to forbear. If such works ever exercise a beneficial tendency, it must be in the season of age, when torpor is stealing over the faculties, when the feelings need quickening by touching the nerve of early and tender association, and memory would sink into lethargy, were she not awakened by the heart. They can no longer mislead the traveler when his journey is accomplished. He can compare their highly-colored delineations with the sober truth of life's 'thrice-told tale,' and be safely entertained. Yet there is no need for the young to exhaust the cordials of age. It is wiser to be busied in furnishing a full storehouse for that approaching winter, where the errors of seed-time cannot be corrected, nor the sloth of harvest repaired; when the mind, in its weariness, is too feeble to dig, and in its poverty, to 'beg will be ashamed.'"—*Letters to Young Ladies.*

Here is a general dissuasive against novel-reading. The cases in which it is allowed are, to the young, as a mere "recreation;" and then, only "under

abstract we would not object. But what, if by this kind of reading an appetite for fiction is created which becomes more and more craving, and finally so morbid that it requires the abominable trash which corrupts and blasts whatever it touches? It is not the use of a single drop nor a single glass of wine that constitutes the evil of intemperance; but if one drop should create an appetite for stimulating drinks, and should thus constitute the commencement of a train which should lead to habits of gross intemperance, it is not to be judged of in the abstract. In forming an opinion of the character of the first act, we must look at it in its connection with ulterior consequences.

And we maintain that when young persons, especially, commence novel-reading, the probability is so strong that they will go from good to bad, and from bad to worse, as to make the experiment exceedingly hazardous. How many young persons of both sexes have been totally spoiled by the novel-reading mania! How many students in our boarding-schools and colleges have, through this mischievous agency, lost all relish for study, and finally become totally disqualified for severe mental toil of any kind! To this class of young people, history, travels, and poetry, are dull, "*very dull*," the study of languages and philosophy "horrible," and that of mathematics "absolutely beyond all endurance!"*

the guidance of an experienced and cultivated mind;" and to the old, "when torpor is stealing over the faculties." Perhaps, under such circumstances, a slight attention to works of fiction may be admitted. But for young persons, without this wise supervision, and old ones, whose faculties are not becoming *torpid*, according to our excellent, fair adviser, this species of reading is dangerous, and may be pernicious. But no admission is made here at all, so far as the grosser kind of novels are concerned. These are to be unconditionally, and in all cases, proscribed, as "evil, only evil, and that continually."

* "There has been considerable difference of opinion in regard to the effects produced upon the mind by fictitious narratives. Without entering minutely upon the merits of this controversy, I think that it may be contended that two evils are likely to arise from much indulgence in works of fiction. The one is a tendency to give way to the wild play of the imagination—a practice most deleterious both to the intellectual and moral habits. The other is a disruption of the harmony that ought to exist between the moral emotions and the conduct—a principle of extensive and important influence. In the healthy state of the moral feelings, for example, the emotion of sympathy excited by a tale of sorrow ought to be followed by some efforts for the relief of the sufferer. When such relations in real life are listened to from time to time without any such efforts, the emotion gradually becomes weakened, and that moral condition is produced which we call selfishness or darkness of heart. Fictitious tales of sorrow appear to have a similar tendency—the emotion is produced without the corresponding conduct; and when this habit has been much indulged, the result

Some mistaken parents permit, and even encourage, their children in this species of reading, to keep them from idleness and give them a relish for books. But all experiment shows that novel-reading does not beget a taste for general reading: instead of this it wholly vitiates the taste and the moral feelings. Indeed, our children may better run the streets and read nothing, than pore over tales of love and murder, and become familiar with the gross and profane language and monstrous characters which are found in the most popular works of the class. He who would put into the hands of his children the works of Bulwer and Sue* to preserve

seems to be, that a cold and barren sentimentalism is produced, instead of the habit of active benevolence. If fictitious narratives be employed for depicting scenes of vice, another evil of the greatest magnitude is likely to result from them, even though the conduct exhibited should be shown to end in remorse and misery; for, by the mere familiarity with vice an injury is done to the youthful mind, which is in no degree compensated by the moral at the close. Imagination, therefore, is a mental power of extensive influence, and capable of being turned to important purposes in the cultivation of individual character. But to be so, it must be kept under the strict control of reason and virtue. If it be allowed to wander at discretion through scenes of imagined wealth, ambition, frivolity, or pleasure, it tends to draw the mind from the important pursuits of life, to weaken the habits of attention, and to impair the judgment. It tends in a most material manner to prevent the due exercise of those nobler powers which are directed to the cultivation both of science and virtue."—*Dr. Abercrombie.*

* One of the translators of "The Wandering Jew" admits that the author, M. Sue, "holds doctrines which are as utterly unphilosophical as they are irreligious and immoral. M. Sue, in a word, is a Fourierite, and as such, he brings forward boldly all those monstrous tendencies of that false philosophy, as its avowed principles, which thinking men have long discovered and abhorred as its ulterior and necessary consequences. In short, he admits openly, that by social regeneration, he understands the abolition of the marriage tie—the holiest and purest thing on earth—and the substitution for it of association or concubinage, to be adopted at will, and cast aside on weariness; and that between persons of all ranks and colors. In short, he admits openly, that to the establishment of this new philosophy, the previous demolition of the whole structure of Christianity is necessary."—*Translator's Pref.*, Winchester's ed.

These are the facts, and yet the translator says he "does not esteem the book dangerous" for the reason, that "all that is necessary to the overthrow of evil and immoral sophistries, is, that they should be seen and understood. The moment the poison is confessed the antidote is ready,—the poison itself is its own antidote."

Now, though we admire the candor of Mr. Herbert, the translator, we wholly object to his philosophy. There are cases in which "the poison is not the antidote," and this is one of them. It might as well be said that a man may put fire into his bosom, provided he *sees* the glowing of the burning coals.

them from idleness, or from bad associations, would prevent a less evil by the substitution of a greater one.

The abundance and cheapness of this kind of literature make the danger the more alarming. The poison is so plentifully scattered abroad, that it requires no little care and wisdom to avoid contact with it. Sixpence, and sometimes a single penny, is sufficient to procure a tale which contains a world of evil. We would not purchase infected goods because they are cheap—we would not send our children to the race-ground, the theatre, or the gambling table, though they might enjoy the privilege without charge. But "popular literature" is so "cheap," in these days of improvement, that we must have an abundant supply. Our cupboards and centre-tables must be heavily laden with the precious commodity, without special reference to its character. Better admit the most deadly enemy into our houses—the plague would be comparatively harmless, because it would only expose our families to the momentary pangs of dissolution, whereas bad books ruin their souls for ever.

In answer to all this, it is urged that there is truth in fiction, and that we should converse with truth wherever we find it. There is sweetness in arsenic, but is this a reason why we should feed upon it? The error is the more dangerous because it is mingled with truth. There is something of truth and some exhibition of virtuous example in the worst of the novelists. But this does not sanctify the mass of corruption which lies but partially concealed under them.

The novelists are thought by many to be the best models of style, and are recommended on this account. But models of thought and feeling are infinitely more important than models of style. If an easy, flowing style, is to be purchased at the hazard of vitiated moral feelings, the price is far too great for the gain. We might better see no more elevated specimens of style than those contained in our common English version of the Bible, and the Old English and Puritan writers, than go for more refined ones to the sinks of romance. It is not, however, true that the novelists only use the English language in its purity and richness. We have history, poetry, philosophy, ethics, theology, and indeed everything necessary to be known, in as pure and elegant English as can be found. In the mass of English literature before us we have all classes of style necessary to be consulted as models of literary taste without the aid of novelists. But we must dismiss this subject without either exhausting it fully, or relieving our own burdened feelings. What we have said is the result of much observation and reflection, and has been presented from a strong sense of duty.

The following views on the ruinous influences of the grosser sort of novels upon the public taste and morals are as just as they are pointed:

"'Tales of humor or extreme caricatures of individuals, or of society, or of current customs and impressions—embellished with the most grotesque pictures, and set forth with all the whims and oddities which the most eccentric fancy can invent—these constitute the burden of the press and of the mails. And they appeal never to the thinking man. They call for no previous knowledge, except of the art of reading, and some of them may dispense even with this, so eloquent and intelligible is the language of their broad and graphic pictures to the most uncultivated senses. Anything like sober thought or rational inquiry is exiled from the province which this class of publications has usurped.

"'Vain is the attempt to check the stream of these books that now pours from the press. They come forth as a torrent which no effort can stay. Their circulation far surpasses that of any production of the day; in millions they are printed, by millions read. There is no checking the flood of this evil. Formerly they were luxuries for the luxurious, but now they are for the mass. For a shilling the poor may know and sympathize with as much of the romantic villany of London, the refined and elegant debauchery of Paris, as in former times the rich for his guinea. Pollution is cheapened, corruption has a wide circulation at a small expense; on the centre-table of the city drawing-room, on the rough-hewn boards of the log-cabin, these books have their position; everywhere through our country they scatter moral decay. What can bid this plague to cease? Certainly not the efforts of the individual Christian.

"'The appetite for fiction craves no morality; at the present day it does not even require the decent veil and semblance of it which was wont to be cast over these productions. Their authors may be men of the loosest and vilest habits: still, if they only have a vivid imagination, their works are read greedily by all classes; read to the destruction of all moral feeling, to the utter overthrow of all principles, to the excitement of all evil passions. Men talk of drunkenness—the effect and operation of these books is a perpetual drunkenness of heart and head.

"'And who are they upon whom this evil influence is poured out? Principally the young. The girl and the boy just starting into life with their feelings fresh, their imaginations lively, these, over the whole country, are the mass of our novel-readers. They gloat over the pages of Bulwer, and learn to admire his heroes, who are thieves and swindlers, his heroines, who are prostitutes in sentiment and feeling. They sympathize with the bandits and street villains of Sue, the buffoonery blackguards of Marryatt. For the young are the shilling copies; with the young is the market for the millions of these productions; it is the pocket money of the boy and girl that keeps the press teeming with cheap novels.'"—21*st Annual Report of the Amer. S. S. Union*, pp. 36, 37.

Secondly. In our reading, from among the *good* books which are before us, we should select the *best.* It is impossible for any one,

and certainly for persons in ordinary circumstances, to read all the good books which are at hand. The world is full of books, and there are many excellent works which no one man will ever command the time to peruse. As life is short, and it becomes us, who must so soon give an account to God for the manner in which we have improved our time, to make the best possible use of it, that book which will impart the most substantial improvement—that will best assist us in preparing for the great ends of our being—should be our first book. The Bible is the book of books, and of course should come in first. Then, as we proceed with human compositions, we should exercise a sound discretion. Here we may be asked, how a person in ordinary circumstances shall know which are the *best books*. Let him use all reliable sources of information. In addition to the advertisements, notices, and criticisms of the religious press, let him secure a competent and faithful friend who will give him counsel. That young person who has a wise and safe adviser, to whom he or she can go for direction as to the best reading, is happy indeed. And we fear that few realize the importance of such a counselor. Most persons proceed in their reading without any plan or the least precaution, when in fact there is nothing in this world, aside from what directly concerns the interests of our souls, in which we so much need advice as in relation to our reading. As there is nothing which acts so powerfully upon our understanding and heart, and tends so directly to form our character and fix our doom, so there is nothing in which a mistaken course is so eminently hazardous. We say again, then, and with emphasis, that *those who have the right kind of advice, as to their reading, are happy.*

And here we must be permitted to say, that a great responsibility rests upon the ministry. A minister of Jesus Christ is a shepherd of the flock, and is bound by the nature of his office to supervise the reading of the people committed to his charge. He must point them to, and as far as possible furnish them with, profitable reading. He must, as need requires, warn them against dangerous books. And it is hardly necessary to add, that he should have an acquaintance with books which will enable him to do this; and if he has not, he is but poorly qualified for his work. Bad reading will subvert his hearers faster than he can build them up. Preaching the word and the exercise of discipline will be found ineffectual remedies for the evils which flow from constant communion with bad or doubtful authors. Let your people read everything, or read at random, and you will soon be "shepherds in whose mouths are no reproofs." Our excellent Discipline forbids

"the reading of those books which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God." How can we, as pastors, see that this rule is observed, without having some acquaintance with the literature which our people have access to, and exercising a supervision over the subject! Of course we do not mean by *supervision* an inquisitorial search for heretical books, nor the exercise of discipline when the books read are not immoral. We mean that the shepherd of the flock should *instruct* the ignorant, warn the unwary, and *correct* and *reprove* the wayward, especially in relation to reading, with greater wisdom and diligence than in relation to other matters, as it is really of greater importance than almost anything else. As for those who would think it too small a matter to seek advice of the preacher, or any one else, as to their reading, the probability is, that their habits are already fixed; or at least that they have strong predilections for a species of literature which is already sapping the foundations of their moral sentiments and feelings: it is scarcely to be hoped that they will ever be reformed. It is melancholy to see how many superficial Christians there are in the churches. And how many of these have been made what they are by bad or unprofitable reading, the day of eternity will reveal. And if any have been spoiled through the neglect of pastoral oversight, it will be sad indeed for those implicated in such neglect.

2. Our course of reading should be *comprehensive*. We should not confine ourselves to one or two classes of books; much less should we be satisfied with mere periodical and miscellaneous reading. Some, though they have a taste for reading, and read a great deal, read nothing but history; others confine themselves principally to poetry; and others read nothing but "the papers." Those who only read one class of books may acquire a considerable amount of one kind of information; but they cannot have so thorough a knowledge even of their favorite branch, by confining themselves wholly to it, as they would have by dividing their attention between that and several other branches. For instance, to read poetry to profit, we must have some knowledge of theology, of history, and of philosophy. The mind must be instructed in general principles and general science, fully to enter into the spirit of any one branch of study. There is a natural dependence of all the different branches of knowledge upon each other. And if it were not so, no one branch of knowledge would fully qualify us for the great duties of life. Periodical reading may fill our heads with scraps of knowledge, but will not give us a consistent, comprehensive, and harmonious view of anything. Hence, we should take as wide a range as possible through theology, history, philosophy,

poetry, &c. Having become grounded in these branches by reading and studying books more or less extensive, as time and means will allow, we are then prepared to profit by the sketchy and fugitive matter found in the periodicals of the day. We thus have a nucleus around which we can gather, from all the various sources of information, parcels and scraps of knowledge, and thus continue constantly to enlarge the aggregate amount. We can then classify and lay aside for use in the storehouse of memory, according to the laws of philosophical association, whatever we learn from reading, experience, or observation.

To persons who are engaged in business, and who have made no experiments in this way, it may seem impossible to command the time to read so much as this would require. But a little patience and perseverance, they will find, will encompass the object. We have books in which the elements of knowledge are so compressed and simplified, that they are soon read and easily understood. Most persons waste time enough in useless employments, or reading at random, to master the elementary works upon the different branches of practical knowledge in the course of every year or two. So small, easy, and cheap, are the books upon almost every variety of topic at the present time, that there can scarcely be an apology for any one under ordinary circumstances, who has reached mature age, who is entirely ignorant in relation to them.

3. We should reflect and study upon what we read.

Mere reading is not a source of improvement. If a person wishes merely to amuse himself, he may as well read, if he can find sufficient gratification in the employment, as to do anything else; and his object will be answered when he has killed the necessary amount of surplus time, though he should not remember a single sentence he has read for five minutes. But if improvement is the object of reading, then it is necessary to understand and to remember what we read. And it need not be urged, because it is perfectly obvious, that we can neither understand nor remember anything without fixed, continuous attention, and patient reflection. A book that is not worth studying is not worth reading. Ordinarily, a book that has not something in it that is worth carefully storing away in the storehouse of the mind, is not worth one of our precious moments. And hence there can be no apology for careless reading. But that it is a very common evil to devour books without digesting them, none can doubt. There are multitudes who are always reading, and never the wiser for all they read. Indeed, their reading spoils instead of improving them. It makes them conceited, and stuffs their heads with visions and shadows. They have read so many books

—perhaps whole libraries—surely, think they, none are so wise as we. I, says one of these "hopeful blockheads," have read more than any forty of my neighbors, and certainly I must know forty times as much as any of them! And yet they scarcely have a definite idea of the subject treated, or of the title-page of any book a month after it has been laid by!

Dugald Stewart says:—"Nothing has such a tendency to weaken, not only the powers of invention, but the intellectual powers in general, as extensive reading without reflection. Mere reading books oppresses, enfeebles, and is with many a substitute for thinking."

We will now invite attention to several reasons which urge us—both the ministry and laity—to increased diligence in reading and study.

1. An understanding of our doctrines and ecclesiastical polity, which cannot be attained without much reading and study, is especially necessary at the present time.

Under any circumstances, and at all times, our system requires reading and thought in order to test its efficacy and feel its power, to the desirable extent. Unless we understand our system, its influence upon our character and habits will be slight; and we can by no means understand it well without much reading and patient investigation. A man who cannot read at all—even a child or an unenlightened savage—may so far understand the truths of the gospel as to form a basis for saving faith. But that our faith may be rational, comprehensive, strong, and steady, a more perfect knowledge of the gospel is necessary. This remark will apply with all its force to that form of Christianity called Methodism. Though it is as simple and as near the primitive pattern as it can well be made, still it requires analysis, comparison, and judgment, in order that it may be fully appreciated, felt, and applied. An unread and unreflecting man may very honestly embrace any form of religious truth, and may by the mere strength of his feelings adhere to it with great tenacity. But as he is not an enlightened, so he cannot be an influential, disciple of any religious school: nor will he be proof against the shafts of infidelity or heresy. To be able to make a firm stand against the onsets of sophistry and prejudice, he must always be able to give a reason for the hope that is in him with meekness and fear. He must have at command a reason for embracing one form of Christianity rather than another, which will be of sufficient weight to show that he is moved by convictions rather than impulses, or he will be likely to resemble a wave of the sea driven by the wind. Stable enjoyment, uniform practice, and moral power, are not to be attained by accident. Nor will the idle,

the thoughtless, or the merely impulsive Christian ever attain to the enviable position which these qualifications secure. Would we "grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ,"—would we "be steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord,"—would we "let our light so shine that others may behold our good works and glorify our Father which is in heaven,"—and would we "put to silence the ignorance of foolish men,"—we must know "whereof we affirm," we must be enlightened Christians and enlightened Methodists.

The influence of a Christian denomination is not to be estimated by the number of heads it counts. "Knowledge is power," and will be to the world's end. We may boast of our million of members, and our enemies will smile at our impotency, unless our piety is enlightened. The world knows the difference between sense and sound—an array of masses, and an array of intelligence. And our efficiency in the great work of spreading Scriptural holiness throughout the world will be found to be in exact proportion to our moral power; and that power will always be modified by our knowledge of the principles of Christianity in general, and of Methodism in particular.

But the exigences of the times especially call for an intelligent investigation of the foundations of our faith—for a wide diffusion of the elements of all useful knowledge among our people, and especially among the young, who are rapidly coming upon the stage of action. The world is in motion: many are running to and fro, and knowledge is increasing. A mighty conflict of principles is going on in the world. Error is rife, sin is bold, men are imaginative, and everything seems hastening on to some great crisis. Shall Methodism—the purest and most efficient system of spreading the gospel—be stultified by masses of ignorance, now, just at the time when, above all others since the days of the Wesleys, her peculiar institutions in all their primitive simplicity, enlightenment, and power, are called for by the most urgent necessities? When the wisdom and spirit which animated her great founder, and breathed through her institutions, are eminently necessary, shall her vital power be diminished or remain stationary, through the indifference of her disciples and supporters to her earliest lessons of instruction? Shall a division of the sacramental host who are marshaled and equipped for the van—the front of the battle—fall back and stand in the rear, among the slain and wounded? Where, where is the spirit of our fathers—the militant aggressive spirit which characterized the great Wesleyan reformation of the last century? We must come forth, and take an elevated stand.

We must grasp the sources of knowledge, and direct its movements wisely. We must study the tactics of the opposing hosts, and throw up an impenetrable shield against all their fiery darts.

Some suppose that Methodism has done its work: that the design of divine Providence in its origination was, that it should arouse the world, and then leave the work of its renovation to others: or at most, if it is permitted at all to live, that its mission is wholly to the poor and the vulgar: that it needs no schools or colleges, and should have no books but the Bible. We can never be converted to this theory. We maintain, that as Methodism is more strictly primitive and apostolical, it is better adapted to carry out the apostolical commission, under all possible circumstances, than any other form of Christianity: that it is as well suited to the rich as the poor, to the philosopher as the savage; and that it can avail itself of the spirit of the age, and keep pace with the march of mind, without at all losing its primitive character, or leaving its doctrinal track. That the world has now greater need of it than ever, we have no doubt; and we are equally confident that if it fulfills its destiny it will not only continue, but be increasingly prominent and efficient in the work of the world's evangelization.

2. Another reason why we should give increased attention to books, is, that our sister denominations are doing so.

The evangelical churches are making truly commendable exertions to give power and influence to their literature, and to cherish and increase the love of reading among themselves. Their publications are multiplied, and are sought after and read with avidity. Our Calvinistic brethren have three principal publishing establishments, which issue annually a multitude of publications, which are by various active and systematic agencies circulated throughout the country. The following are the issues of the American Tract Society* :—

"The depositary's statement shows that there have been *printed* during the year (exclusive of the American Messenger, and the Society's Annual Report and occasional documents) 406,500 volumes, 5,529,500 publications, 157,018,000 pages; and *circulated* 374,757 volumes, 5,626,610 publications, 152,727,229 pages, being 61,255,773 pages more than in the preceding year. Total circulated since the formation of the society 2,493,643 volumes, 78,968,243 publications, 1,544,053,796 pages."—*Twentieth Annual Report of the American Tract Society*, pp. 18, 19.

* This society is sustained by Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Reformed Dutch, Baptists, and Low Church Episcopalians; all agreeing in what they denominate "the doctrines of grace."

The American Sunday-School Union publish a portion of their books in the form of a library for Sunday schools, day schools, and families, so exceedingly cheap as to promise a very wide circulation. The following is a statement of the project, and it has since been completed:—

"We are upon the eve of publishing a library well suited to a large class of Sunday schools, as well as for families, daily schools, &c., especially for those whose means of supply are limited. It consists of ONE HUNDRED BOUND VOLUMES, from 72 to 252 pages, and will be sold for TEN DOLLARS. It would be quite impracticable to sell the separate volumes which compose this library, at the prices they bear in this collection. But by having them printed on less expensive paper, and dispensing with some items of embellishment, we are enabled to put the collection as a whole at this price. 'THE TEN DOLLAR LIBRARY' is substantially bound with muslin backs and marble sides, each volume regularly numbered, and ready to distribute, with twenty-five catalogues for the use of the school. We have the satisfaction to believe, that considering the size and number of the books, this is by far the cheapest collection, in this form, which has ever been published in our country."—*Twenty-first Annual Report of the Amer. S. S. Union*, pp. 21–23.

The following is the statement of the Presbyterian Board of Publication:—

"During the year ending March 30th, 1845, the Presbyterian Board of Publication have added to their catalogue twenty-eight new books, amounting in all to 53,000 copies, varying in size from royal 8vo. to 32mo., and in price from four dollars to four cents. Of these works eighteen are sabbath-school books, peculiarly suited in style, size, and price, for the use of children.

"They have also printed 71,500 volumes of new editions from stereotype plates."—*Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Publication of the Presbyterian Church*, p. 3.

We here have a glance at the efforts of one year to furnish the country with popular reading, made by several Calvinistic associations. But a more complete view will be afforded of the power of their system, by noticing the plans which are adopted to circulate these books. They have established a system of "colportage," which is designed, when completed, to cover the whole country, and to introduce their libraries, single volumes, and tracts, wherever they can be sold; and among the poor and destitute, books and tracts are gratuitously bestowed. Here is the statement of the results of this system:—

"It will be seen that one hundred and forty-three colporteurs, volume agents, and superintendents of colportage, have been engaged in the

society's service during the whole or a part of the year, in twenty-four states and territories, (including Texas,) exclusive of those in the service of the society at Boston, and other branches and auxiliaries; of whom one hundred and three are still employed. Of the whole number three colporteurs have been devoted to the Welsh, Irish, and colored population; three to sailors and seamen; four to the French; twenty-six to the Germans, (including converted Romanists,) and a hundred and seven chiefly to the destitute native population. The total number of families visited exceeds one hundred and fifty-three thousand, with most of whom the colporteurs have had religious conversation or prayer: not far from forty-seven thousand families, who were previously destitute of all religious books except the Bible, were each supplied with a book like Baxter's Call *gratuitously*, and several thousands with the Bible or Testament, by sale or gift. The total circulation of volumes exceeds three hundred and seventy-four thousand, including twenty-four thousand sets of D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation."—*Twentieth Annual Report of the American Tract Society*, p. 51.

The following will give the details of the system more fully, and will show what the probable results will be when it is fully developed:—

"Mr. Seely Wood, reporting the labors of his associates in the western and south-western states, writes:—

"'It may not be uninteresting to the friends of the colporteur enterprise to know that since 1841 the work has been commenced in forty-four counties in Ohio, exclusive of the Western Reserve; forty-five counties in Indiana; fifty-five in Kentucky; twenty-one in Tennessee, exclusive of the eastern portion; twenty-two in Illinois; thirteen in Missouri; nineteen in Arkansas, and eleven in Mississippi; and since that period, including the circulation of two or three volume agents, 209,516 volumes have been circulated, of which 57,288 have been granted to the destitute.

"'To carry forward the work efficiently in the counties where it has been commenced, and to occupy as many more counties within the same period of time, we need a large increase in the number of well-qualified laborers. Large portions of Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Kentucky, should be occupied the present year.'

"The interesting details of western colportage are classified in the subsequent pages of this document. We insert in this connection simply the statistical results of the labors on the field superintended by Mr. Wood. The aggregate of *sales* is 45,624 volumes, amounting to $11,406 93, and of *grants* about 18,000 volumes, besides tracts, making 5,590,710 pages in all, amounting to $3,727 14.

"OHIO.

"Mr. Solomon Sala, who has labored in Tuscarawas, Stark, Holmes, and Coshocton counties, reports the sale of 1,980 volumes amounting to $495 05, and the grant of 605 volumes of the value of $99 56.

"Rev. C. Danforth commenced his labors in November, in Highland county, and has visited 460 families; conversed and prayed with 405; sold 456 volumes, and granted 300 to the destitute; found 66 families without the Bible, 60 of whom he supplied. A portion of his time has been employed in raising funds.

"Mr. David Rothen, laboring among the German population in Putnam and adjoining counties, reports from April to August, (when his labors were interrupted by sickness,) that he visited 534 families, sold 217 volumes, and granted 358 to the destitute. He has resumed his labors with encouraging prospects.

"Mr. Geo. F. Yahnke (German) reports the sale of 674 volumes and the gift of 264 volumes to the destitute in Pickaway, Ross, and Pike counties.

"Mr. Philip Lacker has visited more than 1,000 families in Montgomery, Preble, Warren, Butler, and Miami counties, Ohio, and Wayne county, Indiana; and has circulated 1,386 volumes by sale, amounting to $348 29, and granted 1,675 volumes of the value of $212 34. He has made it a point to supply as far as possible every destitute family with the Scriptures, and has distributed 41 English and German Bibles, and 68 English and German Testaments.

"Mr. Thomas Spencer reports that he has sold 2,528 volumes, and supplied 606 destitute families gratuitously, in Laurence, Pike, and Gallia counties. He has distributed a number of Bibles, and about 300 Testaments. He frequently lectured four and five times a week on the subject of temperance, and found it profitable at the close of his lectures to distribute temperance tracts and books.

"Mr. Leger Ritty, laboring among the German population of Ohio, reports that he has received $155 99 for publications sold during the year, and that he has granted books and tracts to destitute Romanist families, to the value of $198 66. Many encouraging statements from his letters will be found in subsequent pages of the Report."—*Ibid.* pp. 65, 66.

We do by no means present these facts for the purpose of opposition or censure. We would not have the country alarmed at these formidable efforts to spread books and to make converts. The books in the main are good, and the colporteurs are self-denying, godly men, and are doing a great and good work, and one in which we most heartily bid them God speed. Our object is to excite emulation, or, if possible, to awaken the Methodist mind in the country upon the subject of increasing the circulation of our own books. We see that if our books are not procured and read by our people, others will be. And, however valuable may be the publications of these associations for those who are attached to the Calvinistic churches, who of us will question whether ours are not better for us—for our churches and congregations? In one instance, a colporteur in the south-west circulated "sixty volumes at a *camp-meet-*

ing." And in another instance, it is stated by a colporteur, that "an aged Methodist found a copy of Baxter's Call twenty miles below his place of residence, and was so well pleased with it, that he borrowed it;" and he proceeds to say: "When I came to his house he had just finished reading it, and said of it, 'That book is all marrow.'"

Now, the books distributed at the camp-meeting, doubtless, did much good, and Baxter's Call was good food for this "aged Methodist." We rejoice in these interesting facts, as heartily as any one else can. We do not note them for the purpose of fault-finding. By no means. But they are worthy of note for other reasons. They teach us, that with suitable efforts our own books might be much more widely diffused, and they teach us also, that if we will not supply the people who wait upon our ministry with books, our enterprising brethren of the American Tract Society will do it for us. And if our people cannot get Baxter's Call and the Saint's Rest, abridged by Mr. Wesley—as we publish them—why then let them get them from the colporteurs, as published by the American Tract Society. And if they cannot have Wesley's Sermons, and the Lives of Bramwell, Mrs. Rogers, Carvosso, &c., then it is, doubtless, a great blessing for them to have the practical works of Doddridge, Flavel, and President Edwards. But why will our people "go abroad" for food when they "have a feast at home?" We fear our excellent system is not always so fully carried out as it might be: that we too often content ourselves with preaching to the people, and gathering them into the church, without supplying them with the means of spiritual health and comfort when we are absent from them: that after housing them in the church, we, in too many instances, leave them to get books as best they may. And if, indeed, there is anything better than our own publications, then let them go out of the market, and let us give up the publishing business. But what intelligent Methodist believes this? Who among us believes that there is anything in the language better calculated to impart sound Scriptural views of the plan of salvation, to awaken the consciences of sinners, and to build up believers in the faith of the gospel, than the writings of our own divines? Whoever may prefer other books, ours are best for us; and, indeed, we believe they are among the best books for general circulation. And yet there is a strange apathy among us in relation to their circulation. But we must return from this digression.

The principal use we intended to make of the facts above presented, was to show that the religious communities around us are giving increased attention to their own literature, and that the re-

sult will be that the portions of the community which adhere to them are likely to be well instructed in religious truth in general, and in their own peculiar views. The great mass of the publications which these associations are publishing and circulating with so much diligence occupies general ground; and, so far as it goes, will continue to elevate the standard of religious knowledge among the people—particularly among the young. A portion of the publications of the Presbyterian Board is strictly denominational; and presents the doctrines and polity of the Presbyterian Church in all their strength. Among these are the Confession of Faith, Larger Catechism, Calvin's Institutes, Green's Lectures on the Catechism, Questions on the Confession of Faith, Miller on Ruling Elders, Scott's Translation of the Synod of Dort, Scott's Force of Truth, Dickinson on the Five Points, Owen on Indwelling Sin, Snodgrass on Sanctification, &c. Such books, freely circulated and diligently read, will arm and equip the people, even the young, for defense and aggression; and will not fail to give them a decided advantage over us, unless we are equally well read in the general principles which we hold in common with them, and in our own distinctive doctrines and polity. If the Calvinistic churches are prepared to converse intelligently upon the great principles of Christianity, and also upon their own distinctive doctrines and usages, and we are unread, the result will be that while they are strong in their positions, we shall be weak in ours. It will be of little avail to us that we have the argument on our side, if we are not able to wield it; nor shall we be able to maintain our influence over the public mind. Those who are the better read will carry with them the portions of the community which wield the strength and influence of the country: and whatever advantage we may have over them in point of Scriptural truth and consistency, they will do the most good and will exert the greatest influence over the public mind. The truth always suffers in unskillful hands. And if we would not suffer that beautiful system of doctrines and polity which our fathers drew from the Scriptures, and set forth with such admirable simplicity, to be disparaged and to lose its appropriate influence, we must study it, understand it, and thus be prepared to honor, maintain, and defend it. A bad defense often dishonors the truth, and a poor representative disgraces a good cause. Is there any reason why the Methodist people, old and young, should not be as well read as any other religious community in the land? We see none. And yet we fear that we may fall behind our enterprising brethren of other churches in the average progress of religious knowledge. If it should be so, it will be our own fault. It will

not be the fault of our literature, but of our disposition. It will be because we have no heart to improve the price put into our hands to get wisdom. Let us learn by the examples around us. Let us not sleep in the midst of so many fellow Christians who are wide awake.

3. Another reason which should stimulate us to increased exertions in reading, is the multiplication and destructive influence of errors and heresies in the land.

The most extravagant and ruinous doctrines are propagated with a zeal which puts to shame the most earnest and truth-loving of our evangelical churches. And as truth in all its forms and phases has its literature, so has error. And why, if error has its apostles and martyrs, should it not also have its literature? Rome in some circumstances has condemned the press, but now in this country, where her votaries will read something, she is hard at work to provide reading which may not be tainted with heretical pravity. Where Bibles are so thickly strewn that "the faithful" cannot avoid them, the Douay Bible, always accompanied with *notes*, is permitted. And where people will think and must reason, "the Catholic faith" is *argued*, and plausible, but most sophistical, apologetic productions are circulated in abundance. These are calculated—as they are often, we fear, designed—to deceive the simple. And the influence they sometimes have over those who are not read in the controversy is really lamentable. The unblushing confidence with which the Jesuitical defenders of Rome assert their heresies, takes some minds by surprise. They are subdued by the fiery eyes of the lion, and surrender without a struggle.

Puseyism is Romanism under a new guise. Its arrogant assumptions of ministerial power, church exclusiveness, and sacramental grace, are the very essence of Popery. And these dogmas are boldly and industriously propagated in books and periodicals, numerous and various.

We need scarcely mention Millerism, Mormonism, and other similar offshoots of fanaticism, all of which have their various publications.

It must be obvious that from these sources the "unlearned and unstable" will be constantly exposed to ruinous deception. They are the individuals who fall an easy prey to the different forms of error. It is not always the true policy to suppose that novel and strange conceits are so absurd that they will deceive nobody, and so leave them to themselves. Honest and good people are often strangely beguiled from the simplicity of the gospel, and utterly

and irrecoverably ruined before their shepherds are aware of the mischief.

What is to be done under all these perils, but to increase the action of the machinery which is to produce the means of knowledge, and to scatter those means plentifully among the people? The safety and efficiency of Protestantism consist in the diffusion of her literature. Her principles bear the light of investigation, and always have full scope where the mists of ignorance and false philosophy are dispelled by the pure light of her literature. Let the Bible and the writings of the great Protestant authors but be familiar to the people, and they will be covered as with a coat of mail against the shafts of the abettors and teachers of heresy.

4. Such a course of reading and study as we insist upon will constitute a strong barrier against the aggressions of a corrupt literature.

Let the mind be furnished with wholesome nutriment, and it will nauseate the trash which is afloat. There will be no appetite for the foolish fictions—as false to nature as they are corrupt in principle—which are published and circulated in abundance. Mere maxims of prudence and warnings will not keep from our family circles the objectionable publications of the day. Reading is a want which all but mere muck-worms feel. Habits of sober thought and profitable reading only can naturally be expected to prevent injurious contact with bad or unprofitable books. But we must bring this article to a close.

We will conclude first by urging our people—one and all, old and young—to an increased and earnest attention to our own literature. Our books and periodicals should be more extensively circulated among our people. We see too few of our own excellent publications upon the shelves and centre-tables of our friends. And we are often led to inquire, what are the authorized agents of our publications doing to furnish the people with them? Too many of the orders which our agents at the Book Room receive from the preachers are evidently made up of books which they design for their own use. It is well for us to read ourselves,—and it is to be feared that too many of us read but little;—but shall we not also provide for the people? Does not this come within the range of our regular pastoral duties?* Indeed, unless we can persuade our people to read, they will make but poor Methodists.

* It is worthy of serious inquiry, whether, in the places where the preachers do nothing in the way of circulating our publications, some system should not be instituted to do this work by means of *colporteurs*. We should like to see the experiment made in all our large cities.

A brother who has recently circulated a large number of Wesley's Sermons among his people, informed us, a few days since, that he already began to see the fruits. His people were evidently improving in religious knowledge. He could perceive it in their prayers, in their exhortations, and in their religious conversation in class-meeting and elsewhere. We have in our societies multitudes of new recruits, who need more theological knowledge—who are but poorly acquainted with our literature. They need not only encouraging and admonishing upon the subject, but to be told that such and such books are on sale at the Book Room, and they can be furnished with them if they wish. And we must be permitted to say that, in consequence of the neglect of this, we have serious fears that our Methodism is degenerating. Could we wake up our ministry upon this subject we should gain a leading object. What changes might not be effected in one short year by a vigorous effort upon the part of the preachers to circulate our books, and to induce the people to read them?

Some will say they have no time to read. Nonsense! Who does not know that *time* can always be found to do what we very much *desire*—what we *love* to do, and *will* do? If the time, which is lounged away, whiled away, gossiped away, was improved in profitable reading, what great and glorious results would follow! If our young people would but spend a tithe of the time which they now occupy in making and receiving calls, and various other forms of mental dissipation, in reading the writings of Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, Watson, &c., how much better members of the church would they become, and how much would their religious comforts increase, and their prospects for heaven brighten! Let the ministry look to this matter: let parents awake to the great moral and religious interests of their offspring: let all consider the subject as it personally concerns them, and a great and general reformation of character and habits cannot fail to follow.

ART. V.—1. *New Method of learning to read, write, and speak a Language in Six Months; adapted to the German.* By H. G. OLLENDORFF. 3 vols. 8vo. London: Whittaker & Co. Reprinted with Additions. By G. J. ADLER, A. B. New-York: Appleton & Co. 1846.

2. *A Practical Latin Grammar, adapted to the Natural Operations of the Mind, on the Plan pursued in the Public Schools of Germany.* By L. E. PEITHMANN, LL. D. London: Orr & Smith.

3. *A New Latin Delectus.—A New Greek Delectus.—Constructive Exercises for teaching Greek from the Beginning by Writing.* By ALEXANDER ALLEN, Ph. D. London: Taylor & Walton.

4. *Smith's Latin Exercises for Beginners.* London: Taylor & Walton. 1840.

5. *Henry's First Latin Book.—A Second Latin Book and Practical Grammar.* By THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M. A., Rector of Lyndon. London: Rivingtons.

6. *A Practical Introduction to Latin Prose Composition.—A Practical Introduction to Greek Prose Composition.* By T. K. ARNOLD, M. A. London. Reprinted: Boston, James Munroe & Co.

7. *The Ciceronian: or the Prussian Method of teaching the Elements of the Latin Language; adapted to the Use of American Schools.* By B. SEARS. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. 1844.

8. *A Grammar of the German Language; arranged into a New System on the Principle of Induction.* By CHARLES JULIUS HEMPEL. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1843.

9. *First Latin Grammar and Exercises on Ollendorff's Method.* By W. H. PENNOCK, Corpus Christi College, Camb. London: Whittaker & Co. 1844.

"WE do amiss," said John Milton, "to spend seven or eight years in scraping together so much miserable Latin and Greek, as might be learned otherwise easily and delightfully in one."* This was in the year of our Lord 1644. "I will frankly confess that I am sad when I reflect upon the condition of the study of languages among us. We spend six or seven years in Latin and Greek, and

* Letter to Hartlib: Prose Works, p. 99.

yet who of us writes,—still more, who of us speaks them with facility? I am sure there must be something wrong in the mode of our teaching, or we should accomplish more. That cannot be skillfully done, which, at so great an expense of time, produces so very slender a result." So spoke President Wayland in A. D. 1830.*

Fifteen years have elapsed, and the day for such lamentations is not over. It is still the case, in too many of the schools of our country, that the chief result of all the instruction given in the ancient languages is to disgust boys with Greek and Latin. And even of the strong minds that are not to be subdued by years of drudgery, there are few, very few, who ever obtain a real mastery of the languages, and these few gain that end, not in consequence of the system generally pursued, but in spite of it. "'Cursed be he,' say the rabbies, 'that keepeth a pig, or that teacheth his son Greek.' If Latin had been included in the anathema, many a poor boy in Christian countries might have wished himself a Jew, that so he might have come under the benefit of the saving malediction."†

Let us follow one of the unlucky wights who is doomed to this seven years' apprenticeship; worse than Jacob's bondage to Laban, and worse rewarded. He leaves home for the first time, sad enough at parting from all the pleasant things of life, yet not half so sad as he would be, if he knew what is before him. The first thing to be learned is Latin; and he is put at it, after the most orthodox fashion, with no tools but a grammar of dry vocables. He is to learn a *language*,—a thing to be spoken and written,—and he begins by trying to hammer into his brain a set of (to him) perverse and monstrous forms, without meaning or object, called declensions and conjugations. After a few months of this pleasing recreation, he gets out of the thicket of etymology, well rubbed and scratched, to be sure, yet perhaps sound in wind and limb. Now, at least, he will get into a green pasture, and even catch a glimpse occasionally of a flower-bed. Not a bit of it. He is plunged at once into a dreary wilderness, ycleped *syntax*, and driven with whip and spur "through thick and thin, over hills and dales, precipices and stumbling blocks, in the dark,"‡ until the breath is fairly out of him. By this time the poor fellow is

* Lectures before the American Institute, vol. i.

† London Quarterly Review, vol. xxxi, p. 100.

‡ Preface to Samuel Hoadley's Accidence, 1758.

pretty well convinced that Latin is nothing more nor less than an ingenious device of severe parents for the torture of boys; and that schoolmasters are only a new sort of Spanish inquisitors. But if the pedagogue is *thoroughly* orthodox, he has only been playing with the poor fellow's nerves thus far; the *peine forte et dure* is yet to come. The unlucky lad finds, that although he has been pronouncing Latin words for months, he has always been pronouncing them wrong; and the proper correction is now to be applied in *prosody*, in the study of which attractive science he stores his head with a strange medley of longs and shorts, with long lists of crabbed words and barren formulas, and with divers sets of verses in rueful Latin, not more rueful, however, or unintelligible, than the elegant English which accompanies them,—and after all, pronounces naturally enough, just as he had been in the habit of doing from the beginning. Well, indeed, might the old grammarians take as the motto of their wearisome books,

> "Per varios *casus*, per tot discrimina rerum,
> Tendimus in *Latium*."

But the boy has got through his grammar, in some way or other, and must now begin to read. A book is put into his hands, say Nepos or Cesar,—or, if the teacher be a greater blockhead than common, Cicero's Orations, or even Virgil, as if difficulties enough could not be found in the language itself, without adding those of oratorical or poetical diction. All translations are things forbidden, and the boy must go to work as if he were a Champollion deciphering Egyptian hieroglyphics, to make sense out of the unknown pages before him, with no other aid than a dictionary for the meanings of the words, and the lumber of grammar with which his head is crammed for their structure. Slowly and painfully he toils at his task, and at last grinds out a clumsy version, in which he has no confidence himself, but which he hopes will satisfy the pedagogue, and that is his only object. This course is continued for another year, with occasional exercises in that most atrocious of absurdities, making bad Latin into worse, and the neophyte is pronounced "ready for college."

To college, then, he goes. After an examination which, in nine cases out of ten, is altogether perfunctory, he is admitted freshman, and spends a year in the same, or very nearly the same, kind of study as before. He meets the classical tutor once a day,—together with twenty or thirty other boys,—reads a scrap of Latin or Greek from the author assigned, answers a question or two in

syntax, and the hour's work is over. So three years more are passed, and the student leaves college with his diploma, to be sure, but with little more Latin and Greek than when he commenced his course. Even the best of the graduates of most of our colleges are unable to translate Demosthenes, Tacitus, or even Cicero, *ad aperturam libri.* The same may be said of English graduates. "Examine," says Bulwer,* "the average of young men of eighteen; open a page of some author they have not read, and, parrot-like, got by heart; open a page in the Dialogues of Lucian, in Statius; ask the youth to construe it, as you would ask your daughter to construe a page of some French author she has never seen before. Does he not pause, does he not blush, does he not hesitate, does not his eye wander abroad in search of his accustomed 'crib,' does he not falter out something about lexicons and grammars, and at last throw down the book, and tell you he has never learned *that;* but as for Virgil and Herodotus, *there* he is your man?" And as for speaking or even writing Latin freely, the thing is almost unknown as an ordinary result of school and college training. Years, money, and labor enough are spent, but there is no fruit.

We are aware that the unnatural mode of teaching which we have hastily noticed is not now in as general use as it once was, and that there has been great improvement, within the last fifteen years, especially. But we doubt, exceedingly, whether the improvement is as great as has been supposed. We could name several institutions in New-England, and a few out of it, in which a more rational method is pursued, but we fear that the list would be a very small one. In many instances, too, where the orthodox plan of grammar, dictionary, and ferula has been abandoned, the worse evil of loose and superficial study has been introduced, and although the scholar is saved from many painful hours and painful blows, he gets, after all, but little learning for his labor. It cannot be said, that either in this country or in England there are any clear ideas of teaching widely diffused among classical instructors; but one thing is certain, and gratifying too,—there *is* a widely diffused conviction of the inefficiency of our common systems, and an active search for something better. Abundant proof of this is afforded in the multitude of elementary books either borrowed from the German or made upon the soil, that have been sent forth of late years, in few, or none, of which is the old system of grammatical drudgery adopted. It is clear that a better day is coming, both in

* England and the English, vol. i, p. 168.

England and America; and the books named at the head of this article are its latest precursors.

All the various modes of teaching languages that have been proposed, however much they may differ in detail, may be reduced to two,—the *orthodox* method, alluded to above, which gives the pupil grammatical principles first, and the language afterward,—and what has been called the *concrete* method, in which the language is made prominent, and the grammar subordinate. The principle of the first method is thus stated briefly by Walch, *Convenit cum ratione, quod prius intelligenda sit lingua, quam loquendo et scribendo usurpanda, quoniam multo facilius est intelligere, quam scribere aut loqui:** the theory of the second by Erasmus, *Linguæ facilius usu, quam præceptis et lectione scriptorum cognoscendæ.* We need not say that, out of Germany, the spirit of the former method is still almost universally prevalent, and that all attempts to substitute the latter, or even a modification of it, have been cried down, until a few years past, as dangerous innovations.

It may surprise many who have not investigated the subject to learn, that nearly all the schemes which have been stigmatized as innovations,—the empirical† methods of Hamilton, Jacotot, Ollendorff, &c.,—are in reality founded, to a greater or less extent, upon principles advanced centuries ago; and advanced, too, even by the very founders of those English seminaries which have so long kept up the worst absurdities of the orthodox school.‡ The system of instruction extant in the days of Erasmus, when Latin was the language of common intercourse among the learned, was in many respects the reverse of the modern grammar and dictionary plan In all the grammar schools founded in the time of Henry VIII., Latin was intended to be taught colloquially. The views of Erasmus were fully adopted by Dean Colet, who founded St. Paul's School, and also by Cardinal Wolsey. The following remarks are quoted from Colet in the Essay before referred to:—

"Latin speech was before the rules, and not the rules before the Latin speech. Wherefore, well beloved masters and teachers of grammar, after the parts of speech, read and expound plainly unto your scholars good authors: and show to them in every sentence what they shall observe, warning them to follow and do like, both in writing and speaking: and be to them your own self, also

* Hist. Crit. Latinæ Linguæ, iii, 6.

† We do not use the word in a bad sense.

‡ See Essay on a System of Classical Instruction. Lond. 1830.

speaking with them the pure Latin very present, and leave the rules."

The Eton Latin Grammar is founded upon one originally drawn up for the use of St. Paul's School, of which Wm. Lily was the first master. The original preface to that grammar (said to have been written by Wolsey himself) sets forth the same principles as those advanced by Colet, and enjoins that boys be taught grammar "not by rote, but by reason;" that all the forms of words should be thoroughly learned "by plain and divers examples and continued repetitions:"—so that even the Eton Grammar itself, stumbling block as it has been to thousands of English boys, was originally intended for oral and practical teaching. Fifty years afterward, Ascham developed substantially the same views in his *Scholemaster*. But, by degrees, the use of Latin in ordinary discourse was dropped to some extent; and, partly on that account, and partly on account of the multiplication of reading books, the oral mode of instruction fell into disuse, and the grammar and dictionary plan,—the silent dullness of the dead letter of books,—took the place of the animated voice of the living teacher. By the time of Milton, there was full reason for his severe attacks upon existing methods: he saw the evil clearly, and proposed the remedy. In the letter to Hartlib, before quoted, he says:—

"If, after some preparatory grounds of speech by their certain forms got into memory, striplings were led to the praxis thereof in some chosen short book lessoned thoroughly to them, they might then forthwith proceed to learn the substance of good things and arts in due order, which would bring the whole language quickly into their power. This I take to be the most rational and most profitable way of learning languages, and whereby we may best hope to give account to God of our youth spent therein."

John Locke went further toward empiricism than any of the opponents of the grammatical method; and certainly his views must be considered ultra in detail, although the general principle is undoubtedly correct. "If grammar," says he, "ought to be taught at any time, it must be to one who can speak the language already: how else can he be taught the grammar of it? I know not why any one should waste his time, and beat his head about the Latin grammar, who does not intend to be a critic, or make speeches and write dispatches in it. When any one finds in himself a necessity or disposition to study any foreign language to the bottom, and to be nicely exact in the knowledge of it, it will be time enough to take a grammatical survey of it."* It will appear

* John Locke on Education.

in what follows, that we do not adopt Locke's views fully: yet his advice was pertinent to the state of instruction in his time. All advice, however, no matter from what quarter, was thrown away upon Eton and Westminster. To be sure, translations of the miserable Latin in which the grammars were composed were put into the boy's hands,* but they had still to commit to memory the barbarisms of *Propria quæ maribus*, *As in præsenti*, *Verba dandi et reddendi*,† &c., and to treasure up scores of euphonious and useful jaw-breakers, such as *Asyndeton* and *Polysyndeton*, *Oxymoron* and *Onomatopœia*, with the elegant doggerel before alluded to under the name of *Prosody*.

Nevertheless, better books *were* produced, even during the long and deadening sway of orthodoxy in England. One of the best elementary works, indeed, that we know of, is, "The Natural Method of Teaching, being the Accidence in Questions and Answers," by Samuel Hoadley, Master of Brookhouse Grammar School, of which we have before us the eleventh edition, 1758. In the preface to this book may be found almost every good notion of Hamilton's system, or Jacotot's, or of the latest German methods; as for instance the following:—

"All that was here intended was

"1. To give so many *Examples* as were judged necessary to give light to the rules and to direct the practice under them.

"2. To propose *Rules*, true, plain, and directive, but those only the main and general ones.

"3. To make *Exercises and Imitations* so easy and many, as might certainly introduce an habit of performing every operation aright.

"5. To cause the *same words* to be fetched over again in the genders, comparisons, declensions, and syntactic rules; and so to fix them that they be in no danger of being lost.

"11. To read to the child so much as we judge fit at a time, and to require him to read it after us with exactness, well observing the quantity, accent, &c., of every syllable.

* Even in Walch's time the absurdity of using a grammar written in a foreign language was perceived: *Præcepta grammatices debent esse conscripta vernacula ejus qui studet linguis perdiscendis.* Hist. Crit. Prolegom., p. 6. Yet it is not a long time since we had none but Greek and Latin lexicons, so strong was the persuasion that the road to classical learning must be thorny in order to be thorough.

† Even so great a man as Dr. Arnold of Rugby could not free himself from attachment to these old forms.

"13. To put him upon getting all that perfectly by heart which is absolutely necessary; but the *Imitations* are only to be turned by word of mouth from one language to the other," &c.—P. 6.

Rules worthy to be inscribed in golden letters in every school-room!*

Little or no advancement was made in elementary teaching in England during the eighteenth century. The grammar schools and universities produced a few great scholars it is true, but the mass of the graduates knew little or nothing of Latin and Greek, and threw away what little they had, as soon as they left the cloisters. Teachers went on after the old *mumpsimus*, despising nature and worshiping formulas;—and schoolboys continued in their Egyptian bondage, suffering daily flogging because they could not make bricks without straw. Up to a very late period, the English system was mechanical, rather than intellectual; and our American system, so far as we had any, was a copy of the English.

In the year 1817, James Hamilton, an Englishman who had been educated in France, revived the method of Locke in a series of books first published, we believe, in New-York. There was a good deal of the charlatan and more of the enthusiast about Hamilton, yet he succeeded in making a great stir for a time. He went to England and gained the support of many able men, and among them of Sydney Smith, who set forth the claims of the system with his usual wit and ability.† But it was a failure after all: and although the system has been revived, in a modified form, at the University of London, under the auspices of some of the ablest scholars in England, and is divested of many of the objections to which it was justly liable in Hamilton's unskillful hands, it has not come into general use, nor do we think it ought to. It errs just as far on the side of laxity, as the orthodox method does on that of severity. The memory of the student is not advantageously exercised, as its substitute is always under his eye; false notions of the idiom of the foreign language are almost inevitable; and, what is worst of all, from the parrot-like nature of the training, the power of discrimination and combination, for the cultivation of which the judicious study of languages is so admirably adapted, is left entirely

* "If all malicious fiends and men" (said Hoadley, in reference to the school-books of his time) "were met in consult to contrive a way to learning, of end less trouble to the master and vexatious toil to the scholar, they could not have found one worse than we have."

† Edinburgh Review, vol. xliv.

undeveloped. In the hands of skillful and accomplished men, such as Professor Long and Dr. Smith, these difficulties may be surmounted; but they still belong to the *system*, and must, we think, for ever prevent its being generally adopted in schools.

Some ten years ago, it seems, Captain Basil Hall, of famous memory, first found out how to learn German. He had tried it again and again, but always found it impracticable until he stumbled on Herr Ollendorff, who was teaching German at the time in Paris, and who led him along not by the nose, but by the mouth, most gently and delectably, into a sufficient knowledge of that noblest of modern tongues. As the captain has always been distinguished for his gratitude, he repaid the skillful teacher a hundredfold, by a puff in "Schloss Hainfeld," that made him at once a man of notoriety and fortune.

"After six months' close application, I can venture to pronounce, that by Mr. Ollendorff's method alone, so far as I have been able to understand the subject, can this very difficult, but very charming language be taught without confusion. By it the scholar advances step by step, understands clearly and thoroughly everything he reads, and as he goes on, he becomes sensible that all he learns he retains, and all that he retains is useful and practically applicable. At the same time, he scarcely knows how he got hold of it, so slightly marked are the shades of daily progression; and so gentle is the rise, that he feels no unpleasant fatigue on the journey. Of course, the student is called upon to exert no small degree of patient application, and he must consent to devote a considerable portion of his time to this pursuit; but he will have the encouraging conviction, that every particle of effort is well bestowed."

Everybody in Paris began to learn German *a la mode d'Ollendorff*, and in all German towns you might find Englishmen and Frenchmen thumbing the "New Method," and repeating its thousand phrases with commendable perseverance. In 1838 the system was introduced into England by the publication of the "New Method of learning to read, write, and speak *a Language in Six Months, for the Use of Schools and Private Teachers*;" and although the complete work extended to three octavo volumes, and was sold at an enormous price,* it soon acquired a great circulation. We

* Teaching is generally worse paid than any other kind of labor: but it seems that when any particular teacher becomes the *rage*, he takes revenge on the public, and "puts money in his purse." We see from an advertisement at the end of Herr Ollendorff's second volume, that he teaches German in London at the pleasant price of £12 10s. sterling per quarter!

have before us the fourth edition. Nor was the reputation of the work confined to Europe: many copies were imported into this country, and of late the demand has been so great, that an American edition has been brought out in excellent style by the Messrs. Appleton, with the addition of a clear "Systematic Outline of German Grammar," prepared by Mr. Adler, of the University of New-York. Nor has this success been by any means undeserved; the book certainly goes further in smoothing the rugged road to German than any other book extant, and that too, not by attempting to dispense with the industry of the pupil, but by making all his industry profitable. It takes all that is good in the Hamiltonian method, by giving the words to be used at once to the student, and not sending him to the dictionary to hunt them out; and it involves Jacotot's best principle of fixing the forms of the language by constant repetition, and supplying grammatical principles only as they are required. These are its chief excellences, and they are essential to any good system. Mr. Ollendorff himself has not always kept them sufficiently in view; nor is his arrangement of the matter by any means the best that could have been devised; and, moreover, the conversational method seems to us too exclusively employed: yet the book, especially with Mr. Adler's appendix, is infinitely better adapted for use as an introduction to the German language than any other that we know of, and we hope it will obtain a wide circulation.

We had intended to speak at some length of Hempel's German Grammar and Manesca's French Course, which go upon the same general principle as Ollendorff's book, and are deserving of great commendation, although the value of the former is diminished by the use of many German phrases not idiomatic; but our limits will not allow us to dwell upon them. There is one feature, however, distinguishing Mr. Ollendorff's method from either of them, which is too important to be passed by, viz.; that he causes his students from the beginning to translate English into German, rather than German into English, first giving them the words to be used, with a sentence as a model, and then causing them to frame such sentences themselves by imitation. The structure of the English language is known to them, that of the German is not: therefore, in translating, as is commonly done, from German into English, the unknown is given to find the known; while in rendering English into German, the *known* is given, the *unknown* to be sought, and all the elements necessary for the solution are afforded. All teachers are aware of the value of this exercise, but never before has provision been made, in a printed book, for carrying it on so thoroughly and completely.

It may be considered an innovation, but we avow our earnest conviction that the dead languages, especially in the elementary part of the course, should be taught in the same way: that writing Latin, and the formation of Latin sentences extemporaneously, should be relied upon *mainly* for the early training, and that translation from Latin into English should be deferred until the student has acquired a tolerable knowledge of the forms of the language and of its syntax. Exercises of this kind, under the name of *extemporalia*, are introduced in the very lowest class, the *sexta*, in most of the German gymnasia, and constitute one great cause of their success in giving boys a mastery of language. Sentences, adapted to the progress of the pupil, and illustrating the idioms of the language as well as its etymology and syntax, are given out by the teacher in the vernacular, and required to be rendered into Latin orally, on the spot, by the pupils. But as the mass of teachers in this country are not prepared to carry on exercises of this kind efficiently, we need *books* furnished with a stock of them ready for use.

It is to meet this very need, that most of the elementary Greek and Latin books mentioned at the head of this article have been prepared. In nearly all of them the impulse of Ollendorff's system can be traced to a greater or less extent. The first in the field, so far as we know, confessedly drawn up on the principles of that system, was *Arnold's Greek Prose Composition*, which appeared in 1838. The preface states that the

"principles trusted to in the book are those of *imitation and very frequent repetition*. It is at once a syntax, vocabulary, and exercise-book; the syntax being in substance that of Buttmann's excellent School Grammar.—It is due to Mr. *Ollendorff* to state that the publication of a work like the present was suggested to me by the advantage I myself derived from the use of his book. I had originally drawn it up exactly on his plan; but the probable expense of publication has deterred me, for the present, from publishing it in that shape."

Mr. Arnold's book took the popular tide at the flood. He continued to strike while the iron was hot. The first book was speedily followed by another, of *Latin* composition, on the same plan, and both treatises (shade of Dr. Buzby!) were introduced into Eton, Harrow, and Rugby, on a day which (all school-boys will agree) ought to be marked with a white stone. Of all Arnold's series we consider the Greek Prose Composition to be the best; and we have given it a sufficient trial to be well acquainted with

its qualities. It is far from being faultless, yet certainly no book of its kind in the language can compare with it.*

These were not strictly elementary books, and did not afford full scope for the working of the system. Mr. Arnold proceeded, with more than convenient speed we should think, to issue his *Greek Accidence*, and *Henry's First Latin Book*, designed for the use of beginners in the languages. We regret to be compelled to say that these are executed in a careless and slovenly manner; the Greek Accidence, especially, would be very difficult to teach, in its present form. Henry's First Latin Book begins with the accusative case of nouns of the third person singular of a few tenses of the verb, thus affording the pupil the means of framing sentences at once. But the book is almost without method, and thus lays itself fairly open to the charge so commonly brought against works of the kind, of cherishing the memory of the student at the expense of his discrimination.†

The books of *Allen* and *Smith*, as might be expected from their scholarship, are of a higher order than Arnold's on the whole, though the principle of *repetition* is not so constantly brought into play. Smith's *Latin Exercises for Beginners* is a model of excellence, both in point of arrangement and completeness; how far it was suggested by Ollendorff's method we do not know, but the following extract from the preface will show that it has imbibed its spirit at least:—

"These Exercises are intended for the use of pupils who have not yet learned anything of the Latin language; and they form, at the same time, a grammar, vocabulary, and exercise book. It has been found by experience that many advantages result from this mode of teaching the language. It relieves the learner at the commencement of his study from the drudgery of committing to memory the declen-

* A neat edition of this book has been published by Munroe & Co., Boston. We regret that the American editor has made some changes in the book for the worse: but yet it deserves our cordial recommendation as the best book of the kind in the market.

† Mr. Arnold's series further embraces *Latin Prose Composition*, Part II; *Longer Latin Exercises*, Parts I and II; Introduction to *Latin Verse Composition*, and *Materials for Translation into Latin*. These books are principally compiled from Grotefend, Grysar, Krebs, and Hand, and contain a large amount of excellent matter. As our purpose in this article is to restrict our attention to elementary books proper, we say nothing of these for the present, except to remark that as a series, Mr. Arnold's books lack coherency, and show plainly, what was the fact, that he did not "see the end from the beginning" of his labors. Yet he is deserving of great praise for the immense advances that he has made on all his English predecessors.

sions, conjugations, and rules of syntax, which, under the common system, he is obliged to do before he can translate an English sentence into Latin; and, at the same time, it gives him an interest in the subject, which is the best guaranty for his progress. No form is required to be learned till it is actually wanted in the composition of a sentence; and the examples, which are given under each rule, are so numerous that the pupil will find it difficult, even if he wishes, to forget the lesson he has been taught.—It may, perhaps, be thought by some teachers that there are too many examples given under each rule, and that the same words are repeated too frequently. It should, however, be recollected, that since boys usually begin to learn Latin at an early age, it is necessary to make the exercises as simple and easy as possible; and if I have erred in this respect, most teachers will allow that I have at least erred on the safe side."—P. 4.

Allen's Greek Delectus is founded on Kuhner's Elementary Grammar;* indeed, its selections are taken wholly from that work. As it loses sight almost entirely of the great principle of constant repetition, and presents too many forms at once to be learned by the pupil, we cannot class it among the *new* elementary books, although, like everything of Kuhner's, it is excellent in its kind.

Most of the London University books adopt the *crude form* theory, and employ it, *ab initio*, in elementary instruction. We are not insensible of the value of this theory in explaining the formation of the languages to which it is applied, and regard its complete development as one of the most beautiful and perfect results of modern etymological research; but after long and careful observation, we are compelled to believe it not only inappropriate to an early stage of instruction, but certainly embarrassing to the beginner. To take one instance out of many,—the formation of masculine nouns in *us*, commonly said to be of the second declension, but which, in this system, are crude forms in *o;* e. g. *dominus*. The pupil is told that the crude form is *domino*, and that to form the nominative and accusative, *o* must be changed into *u;* to form the vocative, into *e;* the genitive, into *i*. How much more simple is it to tell the boy that the word, in each case, consists of two parts, the stem, which remains unaltered, *domin*, and the case-ending, *us*, *i*, or *o*, as it may be, which needs only to be affixed to the stem? In this matter, and others of the same kind, we incline, after all that has been written upon the subject, to follow the opinion of Zumpt, whose excellent practical judgment cannot be disputed:

"In regard to etymology, it ought not to be forgotten that the

* Elementargrammatik der Griechischen Sprache, nebst eingereihten Übungsaufgaben zum Übersetzen aus dem Griechischen ins Deutsche, und aus dem Deutschen ins Griechische.

Latin language is something which has been handed down to us in a given form, and which is to be learned in this given form. It would have been easy to go back to certain primitive forms which constitute the first elements in the formation of the language, and thereby to explain many an irregularity in the mixture of forms; but in teaching a language which is learned not only for the purpose of training the intellect, but of speaking and writing it, the eye and memory of the pupil ought not to be troubled with hypothetical or assumed forms, which he is expected to forget, and which he is rather apt to take for real forms."*

This last sentence states a principle which ought to characterize every elementary book in languages:—*it should lay nothing before the pupil which he is expected to forget.* How few of our grammars are constructed on this principle! Instead of presenting only the ordinary forms of the language, they give, almost without exception, both in etymology and syntax, forms which the student will hardly meet with in ten years of reading, making no distinction whatever between the common and the rare. Until this defect is remedied in the books themselves, "the teacher will need to exercise great care and judgment in selecting for young students only that which essentially belongs to the common forms of speech."†

But, on the other hand, we are fully convinced that everything which the student *ought to remember* should be communicated to him at as early a period of his course as practicable; and that all the doctrines of etymology, which will assist him in catching the spirit of the language, and in forming habits of comparison, analysis, and generalization for himself, should be learned as fast as opportunities occur. Science should go hand in hand with practice, in the acquisition of a dead language especially. Of how many words, for instance, is a boy made master at once, when he learns the value of the formative endings, *tas, tus, io, ilis, bilis*, &c.; and how rapidly his power of analysis and generalization grows in the practice of word-building when the materials are once placed in his hands! Yet the very opposite doctrine is maintained, not merely by Hamilton and his school, but by advocates of what we have called the orthodox method, on theoretical as well as practical grounds. Some years ago, an able writer (who, although one of the Pharisees, seems to have imbibed a good deal of the classical spirit) uttered the following oracular wisdom:—"A boy, beginning the study of the Latin language, with the variations of the different cases, if he is bright, will ask, What is the origin of

* Preface to Grammar, Ed Schmitz, 1845, p. 8.

† Introduction to Ciceronian, B. Sears, p. 22.

these cases? what relation they have to each other? A judicious instructor, instead of entering into a part of the philosophy of language, thence to prove the necessity of the existence of cases, will tell him to wait a short time, receive merely this fact, the existence of cases, and hope for a fuller understanding with the progress of his knowledge."* A judicious instructor will do no such thing: but will rather seize with eagerness the opportunity of fixing in the mind of such a "bright boy" a clew to the whole difference between English and Latin on the score of inflections; he will give him the value of a case-ending, and tell him that he can apply it not merely to the one word which he has learned, but to hundreds besides. What "judicious teacher" has not seen the eyes of a "bright boy" light up with kindling enthusiasm as such a comprehensive truth has, for the first time, flashed upon his mind? It is the profound remark of Goethe, that "education consists in observing *wants*, and satisfying them;" and the supply should be afforded just when the want is observed.

We are happy to find these views confirmed by a high authority in our own country. In the plan of instruction prefixed to the "Ciceronian,"† the doctrine of constant imitation and repetition is constantly insisted upon; but the necessity of fixing accurate etymological notions in the pupil's mind at the outset of his course is enforced with equal earnestness. We know not where we could find a greater amount of practical wisdom on the subject of elementary teaching than is compressed into the Introduction to this little volume; and we are persuaded that if its methods could be generally pursued in our schools, a few years would show a great improvement in our classical training. The character of the system may be seen from the following passage:—

"A moderate quantity of the purest and best Latin prose, in selections, is made the basis of the pupil's knowledge of the language. The selections are arranged systematically, both with reference to the subjects and to the construction of sentences. The study of these is to commence simultaneously with that of the grammar, and to be carried on, first, by an ordinary preparation on them, then by committing them to memory; and, finally, by very frequent reviews. What is thus learned is to be made the life and soul of all grammatical instruction, the germ of all future acquisitions in the language. It is believed that not far from a hundred pages can be selected, mostly in short and perfect sentences, from the works of Cicero, which shall contain the

* American Quarterly Review, No. xii.

† Taken from Meiring and Remely's Lateinisches Memorirbuch, oder Stellen, &c., aus Cicero. There is a larger selection adapted to Ruthardt's Plan,—the Loci Memoriales of Gossrau, Kallenbach, and Pfau.

substance of the ordinary forms of the Latin language. The perfect mastery of all the principles involved in these, would not only secure the most exact mental discipline, but lay the most solid foundations for future attainments in philology. It would place one, as it were, in the capital of a country, and render it easy for him to make excursions in any direction, at pleasure."—Pp. 2–4.

As the editor remarks, this plan is only in a modified sense original; even the radical principle itself seems to be only a modification of Jacotot's Epitome; but its development in a form at once scholarlike, and very convenient for practice, is its great merit. We hope the book will get into extensive use.

The suggestions given in pages 34 and 35 of the Introduction, in regard to extemporary constructions on model sentences, bring the plan of the Ciceronian within the scope of the system of instruction advocated in this article. But we are satisfied, that in the present state of our American schools, a preliminary grammar, presenting only the ordinary forms of the language, and well furnished with models of good Latinity, and with English sentences to be turned into Latin, on the basis of the models thus furnished, is absolutely necessary. With the objections of Mr. Sears to the practice of boys "writing Latin without a model of Latinity in their minds," we fully concur; and, therefore, we abominate those elementary books which give exercises full of modern and barbarous words, and fill the minds of pupils with bad Latin. Yet we are not sure but that there is danger of running to an extreme of carefulness, in permitting the pupil to write *no* exercises, until he can "be placed within the language." Within the language, at the beginning, he cannot be; and it seems to us that the only way in which he can acquire such an interior position is by constant practice; and we believe, too, with Zumpt, that at first "it is advisable to pay attention to variety of expression, rather than to particular neatness or elegance."* Indeed, we should, if it were possible, be willing to bring back the old custom (which is still preserved, to some extent, in the German schools) of causing the recitations of students to be carried on in Latin, just as soon as they learn enough of the language to begin its colloquial use; not having before our eyes the fear of bad Latinity, which caused the Bembos and the Manutii of a former age to reject, in writing, every word or phrase for which they could not find authority in Cicero, and to eschew all Latin speech, for fear of corrupting their taste and debasing their style. We may yet need another *Ciceronianus*†

* Grammar, ninth edition, p. 10.

† A work of Erasmus, principally directed against the purism of Italian scholars.

if Italian purism is again to be revived under Teutonic auspices. While we admit, then, that the pupil should be furnished only with classical models, he should be trained, by imitating them from the beginning, both orally and in writing, to freedom in the use of words.

One great defect in the ordinary books of exercises is, the absence of all rules, or even examples, illustrative of the *arrangement of words* in Latin; there are, indeed, some dozen of these books lying before us, in which the matter does not appear to have been thought of at all, and some of them even claim it as a merit that the lessons to be construed are arranged precisely according to the English idiom. The method of study proposed in the Ciceronian would remedy this evil; and the little works of Messrs. Pinnock and Arnold attempt to provide against it, by furnishing simple rules of position adapted to the successive stages of the pupil's progress. There is an admirable chapter on the subject in Krebs s Guide, but it belongs to a very late period of the course; and the same remark will apply to the extract from Crombie's Gymnasium, (much less just and accurate than the article in Krebs,) which is affixed to Dr. Anthon's Latin Prose Composition; besides these, no American book that we know of affords any really available assistance of the kind to the student. The evil is kept up by the practice pursued in many schools of *construing*, as it is called,—which means, picking out the words of a Latin or Greek sentence in the order of the English, fixing the attention of the learner on "Englished Latin and inelegant English," and doing as much as possible to prevent him from catching the foreign idiom and mastering it. The experience of years has shown us the advantage of causing beginners to translate Latin or Greek *in the order of the original*, observing, at the same time, all idiomatic phrases, and giving them an idiomatic turn in the rendering. After such a direct translation, the pupil should be required to make a free version of the entire sentence of the original into an entire sentence of the vernacular. The advantage of this last exercise is admirably set forth by Dr. Arnold* in an article in the Quarterly Journal of Education,† from which we select the following passage :—

"Every lesson in Greek and Latin may, and ought to be, made a lesson in English. The translation of every sentence in Demosthenes or Tacitus is properly an exercise in extemporaneous English composition; a problem, how to express with equal

* Of Rugby,—not the author of the classical school books.

† No. vii. Reprinted in Appleton's edition of Arnold's Miscellanous Works.

brevity, clearness, and force, in our own language, the thought which the original author has so admirably expressed in his. But the system of construing, far from assisting, is positively injurious to our knowledge and use of English; it accustoms us to a tame and involved arrangement of our words, and to the substitution of foreign idioms in the place of such as are natural; it obliges us to caricature every sentence that we render, by turning what is, in its original dress, beautiful and natural, into something which is neither Greek nor English, stiff, obscure, and flat, exemplifying all the faults incident to language, and excluding every excellence."

All very true; not a bit too severe upon construing, and very correct as to the true way of reading Demosthenes or Tacitus. Boys should not read Demosthenes or Tacitus until they have learned the Greek and Latin idioms, both in regard to the use and arrangement of words and phrases, so that they can take the sense of their author just as he expresses it, *reading* him, rather than *translating* him. But we cannot concur, even with Dr. Arnold, in recommending the exclusive practice of this mode of rendering with beginners; believing, not without good reason, that they will not perceive the foreign idiom and arrangement, unless they first translate in the foreign order. This is a very different thing from construing; but it is a very different thing also from Dr. Arnold's method of free rendering. Our views on this subject are confirmed by Dr. *Peithmann*, whose admirable elementary books have not received the attention they deserve. In the Preface to his Practical Latin Grammar, he remarks,—

"If it is an admitted principle, that to enter into the spirit of any language we must be enabled to *think* and to *feel* in that language, the common practice of construing Latin appears incongruous with the natural process of the mind. A translation from a foreign language should, therefore, be not only a true verbal analysis, but exhibit as near as possible the proper position of words and clauses in a classical sentence. The more it arrests the attention of the learner by its remoteness from his own language, the more will it impress on his mind the idiom and construction of the language he is acquiring; the less will it act upon his English phraseology and his accustomed manner of dressing his thoughts, which is but too often the case in the common method of construing. The observation of a great philologist and critic,* *the more barbarous your translation the better*, was therefore the result of an accurate inquiry into the proper method of teaching languages. But when there is any doubt whether the learner, while he perceives the sense of single words and clauses, understands the

* A. W. Von Schlegel.

aggregate meaning of the whole, the master should immediately present a general view of the sense, as near as possible, in the Latin arrangement. It is, however, evident, that this natural manner of translating can only be effectually resorted to when we proceed on progressive principles, as in this Grammar, commencing with the most simple phrases and constructions, and proceeding, by easy gradations, to more complicated periods."—Pp. 7, 8.

Dr. Peithmann's Grammar is marked by another excellence, which cannot be too strongly commended, namely, attention to the *quantity* of syllables from the beginning. He says,—

"Though it is obvious that, in the order of nature, we acquire the sound and sense of a word at the same time, and that sound and sense, when once acquired, are ever after almost inseparable; yet the common grammars reverse the order which nature has pointed out, and, instead of beginning with pronunciation, furnish the learner with rules (at the end) to correct the vicious utterance which he has acquired in his passage through the book. But years consumed in the practice of versification are often unable to effect this. To enable, therefore, the youthful learner to acquire that correctness of pronunciation which stamps the accomplished scholar, this Grammar begins with the general rules of pronunciation, and points out the quantity of words by constant denotation of their syllables. The special rules have been simplified and compressed into three pages, at the end of the etymological part."—P. 5.

We have thus examined a number of elementary books, and developed principles not generally in use in American schools. Although we have spoken with freedom of the results of the less effective methods of teaching to which we have referred, it must not be supposed that we consider the classical teaching which our schools have afforded in past time to have been valueless. On the contrary, there has necessarily been much mental growth from the labor expended in acquiring even a small amount of knowledge under such unfavorable circumstances; our only objection is, that the circumstances are made unnecessarily unfavorable; that the amount of knowledge and of mental discipline secured are by no means in proportion to the pains and toil expended. Our boys spend as many years generally in their course of training preparatory for college as do the youth of the German Gymnasia; yet one of the latter, after his six years' education, goes to the university at seventeen or eighteen, able to read almost any Latin or Greek author, to write Latin, and even speak it with tolerable fluency, and to listen intelligibly to the Latin lectures of a Hermann; pursues his classical reading, along with all his other studies at the university; and afterward keeps up his acquaintance with the languages of antiquity to the end of life; while an English or Ameri-

can bachelor of arts, as we have said before, generally throws his Latin and Greek books away as soon as he gets his diploma. The system which leads to these results must be wrong; this, indeed, is acknowledged in almost every quarter, and various plans of improvement are pointed out. The teachers of America are a laborious, useful, and honorable class of men: God forbid that any word of ours should be considered as disparaging them; for it is to them that we look, not with doubt or hesitancy either, for the accomplishment of all the great improvements that we hope for.

We now conclude with a brief summary of principles developed more or less fully in the course of the foregoing remarks.

1. The object of studying languages is twofold:

(1.) The acquisition of the languages themselves; and,

(2.) The mental discipline gained in acquiring them. No good teacher will lose sight of either of these ends.

2. No language can be thoroughly acquired without the outlay of much labor and time. All schemes which promise to dispense with such outlay must be pronounced visionary and chimerical.

3. But labor without fruit does not contribute to mental cultivation. Labor is easy if there is method in its expenditure and fruit as its result. Labor and pain are not necessary companions: learning should not be "wrung from poor striplings like blood from the nose, or the plucking of untimely fruit."*

4. The grammar of a language cannot be understood until the language itself is at least partially acquired.

5. The vernacular may be learned, so far as its use is concerned, without grammar: a foreign living language may be so learned, but never so thoroughly, nor even so rapidly, as with grammatical aids. In the study of a dead language grammar is indispensable.

6. "A grammar intended for beginners should be framed altogether differently from one intended for the higher classes, both in the distribution of the matter and in the mode of presenting it. Those who think that the pupil should use the same grammar from the beginning of his course to the end, are quite in error."†

7. In elementary books, or in teaching, no etymological form nor grammatical principle should be presented to the pupil without an immediate application thereof to *practice*, which should be kept up, both orally and in writing, from the very first lesson.

8. The all-important rule of practice, in the acquisition of language, is *imitation* and *repetition*. This is no new invention; all good teachers have known and used it; but yet it has been but slightly employed in elementary books heretofore.

* Milton. † Kühner.

9. Models for imitation should be simple at first, and gradually made more complicated; but they should always be selected from pure authors, say, in Latin, from Cicero and Cesar.

10. The pupil's ear should be trained to correctness from the beginning, and the simplest rules of prosody learned and applied as soon as possible. For this purpose, the quantity of all syllables should be marked in elementary books, and attention to it should be strictly enforced by the teacher.

11. The foreign idiom, both as to the use and arrangement of words, should be made familiar to the pupil by constant practice. Nothing can be more hurtful than exercises in which foreign words are used in the idiom, and according to the arrangement of the vernacular.

12. In elementary training, translations from the foreign language should be made in two ways:—1. Directly, in the order of the original as far as possible; 2. Freely, in that of the vernacular. The first is essential to the study of the foreign language; the second may be made an excellent exercise in our own.

13. The early reading should be in simple authors. No greater folly can be committed than to put Cicero's Orations or Virgil's Æneid into the hands of a boy who cannot write a sentence of simple Latin prose.

It will be perceived that we have confined our remarks to works strictly elementary, and to processes adapted to the earliest stage of instruction in languages. Our range has been wide enough, perhaps, even with this limitation, to weary our readers; should it appear to be otherwise, however, and our discussion be deemed anything else than a *bore*, we hope to take up, at a future time, the question of secondary and higher instruction,—its objects and its methods. It will be observed, also, that we have noticed none of the elementary Greek and Latin Grammars that have been published in this country, of which many are admirable in their kind, while others are quite the reverse. We have purposely avoided discussing the merits of any that we could not commend; and even of those (and their name is legion) which are really valuable in other respects, there are none prepared on the precise system whose merits it is the object of this article to develop. We have left untouched, also, a number of German works which have fallen under our notice: to take them in would have opened an almost illimitable field, which we have not time to traverse at present.

Carlisle, Nov. 15, 1845.

ART. VI.—*Observations in the East, chiefly in Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor.* By JOHN P. DURBIN, D. D., late President of Dickinson College; Author of "Observations in Europe," &c. Two vols., 12mo. Pp. 347 and 299. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1845.

THE publication of two volumes of "Observations in the East," after the recent inundations from that quarter, would seem to be a bold enterprise, and would indicate no ordinary degree of moral courage in the author. Yet here we have them, got up in the best style of the Harpers, with maps, plates, plans, and cuts in abundance, on steel and on wood, with type that does not make the eyes ache, on paper so fine and white that it does,—two handsome and readable volumes, full of amusement and instruction.

He who first explores an untrodden field can easily make a book, for a lively imagination can furnish embellishments for the facts, and if hard pushed, the facts themselves; but he who follows in the track of Burckhardt, Laborde, Wilkinson, Lane, Stephens, Robinson, and Olin, not to mention a host of others, has a more difficult task to perform. He undertakes to lead us through a domain which we have traversed again and again with trustworthy guides, till we are half persuaded that we should find ourselves little at fault if we should undertake the journey without any guide. We know something already of the highways and byways, the scenes and scenery, the men and women, the manners and customs, past and present, of "the land of the sun;" and we hold our conductor to a strict reckoning and a straight path, unwilling to accord him "ample room and verge enough." We are decidedly in haste as we pass along; and wonder why Mehemet Ali has not made a railway from Cairo to Jerusalem, and compelled all travelers to exchange the camel for the car. We almost believe this would be the greatest of his improvements, and a benefaction to the world. We throw a familiar side-glance at Pompey's Pillar and Cleopatra's Needle, as we do at the shops in Broadway when we are hastening to the "Book Concern." We have no longer any patience with monkish legends which credulous tradition pours wholesale into more credulous ears, and our indifference is shocking to the holy fathers. We could even count the ripples on the surface of "Old Nile," as we sit in our study, were it not rather dull business; could feel quite at home taking a whiff from the *hookah* of our venerable friend Tualeb, in his Tawara tent; and enjoy a comfortable siesta on the summit of Cheops.

In this mood, we confess that we opened these volumes with some slight misgivings; not indeed with the malice aforethought in which critics indulge when they mean to *slash*, for our author's "Observations in Europe" had conciliated our good graces, and taught us to regard him as a clever writer, as well as a capital *compagnon du voyage;* but with a lurking suspicion that oriental raw material for book-craft had all been worked up, and in consequence of that suspicion a certain predisposition not to be pleased.

In these misgivings we have been pleasantly disappointed. Dr. Durbin indeed sees what others have seen, and describes what others have described; but he takes his own stand-points, looks through his own spectacles, and groups the objects in the panorama before him so skillfully as to throw an air of novelty over familar scenes. He does more. His visit to the sites of the Apocalyptic churches, and his descriptions of what may be called the *fragments* of "the seven golden candlesticks," are comparatively new to American readers; and form, in our opinion, one of the most interesting portions of the work. He also gives us, in several well-considered chapters, much valuable information in regard to the history and government of Mehemet Ali, the present state of Christianity in the East, the condition and prospects of the Jews, the internal and external relations of the Ottoman empire, and the progress and character of the various Christian missions in the countries through which he passed. Although he disclaims traveling as a discoverer and an antiquary, he has proposed an ingenious hypothesis in regard to the topography of the route of the Israelites in their exodus from Egypt, which we believe has not been suggested by any previous writer. The reader will probably dissent from some of the author's opinions on these subjects; but he will find them presented candidly and fairly, with becoming respect for the views of his predecessors, and without any airs of assumption or dogmatism. We shall revert to some of these topics in the course of the present article.

Dr. Durbin's qualifications as a traveler, and a writer of travels, are of a high order. He is a careful and accurate observer, readily acquires distinct impressions of objects, and an almost intuitive comprehension of their significance, which he generally conveys to his readers with clearness and force. He has resolution and perseverance to perform extra toil that he may see with his own eyes; and whether he is dripping with rain, or blistered with sunshine, he always keeps them open. He has sufficient excitability to be wrought up to the proper pitch of enthusiasm, (as travelers feel themselves in duty bound,) when he treads upon soil consecrated

by glorious or holy memories; and enough of historical knowledge to draw around such spots a cluster of rich associations. He gives continual evidence of a liberal and catholic spirit, when he speaks of sects and creeds which differ from his own; and a cosmopolitan kindness of heart which does not permit him to represent the customs and conduct of men as absurd, ridiculous, or wicked, because they do not harmonize with his occidental notions of propriety. In this respect he is the antipodes of those British tourists in America whose narrow vision can discover no merit beyond the limits of their island home, who grumble because they do not find the elegances of London among the miners of the Alleghanies; and clamor for "roast beef and plum-pudding" in the cabins of the western prairies. He is also free from that credulity which swallows whatever is plausible, and has a stomach for anything; as well as from that skepticism which delights to spread the fog of its native atmosphere over the best-authenticated facts. In a word, our traveler is a man of good common sense, with a fair share of discrimination, and just faith enough. Willingly would we have been one of his "young companions," to whom he so often and so kindly alludes, even at the risk of losing a "milk-white charger," because "altro signore molto grande."

Dr. Durbin, however, has nothing of the poet in his constitution, and would probably look upon the whole "Parnassian rabble" as fools or madmen. The suggestions of his mind, therefore, never take the form which holds us spell-bound in the delicate imagery and intense feeling of Lamartine, and in the living, breathing sketches of the author of Eöthen. These writers transfer to the scenes and objects which they describe the hues of their own spirits; and by thus blending the subjective with the objective, conjure up, as with a magician's wand, forms of beauty which have soul as well as body. We do not charge the want of this power as a defect in our author. Perhaps this very want may make him a more reliable delineator of objective realities, somewhat on the same principle as Xenophon was a more faithful recorder of the doctrines of Socrates than Plato was. The former related what his master uttered: the latter so blended himself with his master, and so dressed up the sayings of the great philosopher in drapery from his own poetic wardrobe, that it is impossible to assign to either exactly what belongs to him.

As impartial reviewers, we are expected, as a matter of course, to find some fault. We must, therefore, inform our readers that the literary execution of this work is not in all respects perfect. While some parts of the book are elaborated with much care, other

portions exhibit marks of a less critical revision. An inaccurate word, an inelegant phrase, and a faulty construction of a sentence, have occasionally escaped the author's notice. But where so much is unexceptionable, and so much more is praiseworthy, we are little inclined to use a lens to magnify microscopic blemishes. A master in criticism has said,

> "Ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis
> Offendar maculis, quas aut incuria fudit,
> Aut humana parum cavit natura."—*Horace.*

Our author having finished his tour in Europe, embarked at Naples, late in December, 1842; and after touching at Malta and Syra, landed at Alexandria early in January, 1843. Thence he proceeded by the Mahmoudie Canal and the Nile to Cairo; by the southern or El Besatin route to the Red Sea and Suez; down the eastern shore of the Gulf of Suez to Mount Sinai; thence to Akabah on the eastern Gulf of the Red Sea; up Wady Arabah to Petra and Mount Hor; and across the land of Idumea to Beersheba, Hebron, and Jerusalem. After an excursion to the Jordan and the Dead Sea, he went from Jerusalem to Samaria, Nazareth, Acre, Tyre, Sidon, and Beyrout. Here he made another excursion to visit Mount Lebanon, Damascus, and the ruins of Baalbec. Returning to Beyrout he took passage by steamboat to Smyrna; visited the sites of the Seven Churches, (with the exception of Laodicea;) crossed Mount Ida to the Troad; sailed up the Sea of Marmora to Constantinople, and thence to Athens, where he bids adieu to his readers.

From this rapid outline of Dr. Durbin's journey, it will be perceived that he passed over ground hallowed at every step by events of transcendent interest in the history of humanity. The Pyramids, the only monarchs whose thrones never totter, and whose dynasty extends through forty centuries; the splendor and learning of Heliopolis and Memphis; the terrible retributions inflicted upon Pharaoh; the triumphant exodus of the posterity of Abraham; the awful sublimities of Sinai; the beauty and desolation of the Holy City; "the glory of Lebanon, the excellency of Carmel, and the dew of Hermon;" the life and death of the Saviour of men; the words of him "that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks;" the classical associations of Ilion; and the eventful history of the ancient Byzantium,—all crowd at once upon our memories, and for a while possess us wholly. At almost every step in the desert, and in Palestine, we seem to hear the voice which spake to Moses

from the burning bush, "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." And as we roam with our traveler through some vast necropolis of Egypt or Asia Minor, the very silence around the crumbling mausoleums of forgotten heroes seems to whisper,

"Stop! for thy tread is on an empire's dust."

It is not our purpose to follow our traveler, step by step, in his interesting "Observations;" much less to make them a pack-horse to bear the burden of a dissertation of our own on the East. We propose nothing more than to present our readers such extracts from the book, and such remarks on prominent matters contained in it, as will enable them to form a tolerably correct judgment upon its merits. The following passage, which describes his approach to Alexandria, is a fair specimen of the author's style. The portraiture of the dirty, sore-eyed Fellahs, with caiques, camels, and donkeys, vociferating for passengers, luggage, and *buksheesh*, is sufficiently graphic:—

"On the morning of the 5th of January, as the sun struggled up through the clouds which pressed down heavily on the sea, the low coast of Egypt showed its sand-swells to the east of the Pharos, or lighthouse of Alexandria, and in the course of an hour the fort and indented sand-coast became visible to the west. The sea was exceedingly high, and the pilot-boat had much difficulty in getting to windward so as to give us the direction of the narrow channel between the shore and the breakers, which extend westward from the lighthouse. But, having once got our bearings, our gallant steamer moved into the deep, safe harbor, and took her station amid the fleet of merchantmen and Egyptian ships of war. It was an animating sight. But when our anchor was down, then indeed commenced the wild hurrah. Countless caiques and skiffs crowded to the sides of the ship to obtain passengers and luggage. They were full of half-naked, tawny, dirty Arabs, and jet black Nubians; the first with heavy coifs around their heads, and the latter with a loose white shirt, and trowsers made of coarse muslin, rolled round their thighs, and coiled up below their knees. Every one talked at the top of his voice, and often with gesticulations so violent as to indicate that momentous matters depended on his being heard. Fortunately, Mr. Rhey, of the Hotel de l'Europe, met with our courier, and, with the aid of his servants, we were all soon disembarked with our luggage, and landed on the dock near the custom house. There we found a ragged, wild-looking crowd, with saddled donkeys for passengers, and camels for luggage. The rush upon us was more violent and boisterous than at Malta. We were about to be taken by force, when Mr. Rhey interfered and put us in his carriage, and pointing to a camel, it stalked forward at the bidding, kneeled down with a complaining groan, and lay quietly on its belly. The confused pile of cordage coiled up on the huge wooden pack-

saddle on the back of the animal was soon opened out into a net-work, spreading on the ground on each side of him, upon which our luggage being placed, and the meshes drawn up by cords, so as to bring the load upon the sides and back of the beast, he rose at the bidding of his driver, and moved away. Arriving at the custom house, he knelt humbly before a grave, turbaned Turk, who came out in his official robes, looked upon the submissive animal, read a letter which our courier had been prudent enough to obtain at the Turkish consulate in Syra, and graciously permitted our luggage to proceed without fee or reward."—Vol. i, pp. 7, 8.

The short account of the commercial capital of Mehemet Ali, and the ruins of the ancient city of the Macedonian conqueror, contains several note-worthy passages; but we are admonished to delay no longer in the abode of Anthony's "Serpent of old Nile," who, failing to fascinate the cool Octavius, died "in the high Roman fashion." We leave the descendants and the Needles of Cleopatra, and hasten to Cairo.

The Egyptian metropolis bears evident marks of dilapidation and decay. Our traveler was disappointed in finding so few remains of the old Arabian magnificence. The houses, even of the better sort, are but specimens of the shabby genteel, and their interior presents little more than an ambitious caricature of the luxurious elegance which distinguished them in the palmy days of Mohammedan sway. He says "the men of Cairo are a fine-looking race, well-formed, erect, and robust;" and is pleased with the grace and dignity of their flowing robes, by the side of which the inventions of the Parisian tailors appear "awkward and ungainly." The costume of the oriental ladies is not in so good taste. A shapeless mountain of drapery, within which is concealed a woman, peering from her peep-hole as she waddles along in clumsy slippers, or perches "*en cavalier*" upon a donkey, is not, according to our infidel notions, particularly graceful. It is a mystery how the fair creatures breathe in a hot day, wrapped up to the very eyes in as many folds as a mummy. The reader will obtain a correct idea of these fashionable costumes from the wood-cuts which represent them, and which are borrowed from Lane.

Of course Dr. Durbin visited the Pyramids, and the ruins of Heliopolis and Memphis. These have been so often and so fully described by others that he has very judiciously disposed of them in a few pages. The following is a picture which a painter might copy:—

"But what a sight is that from the top of Cheops! The world has nothing like it. To the east is the Arabian Desert, boundless and

desolate, like a sea; while westward stretched that of Libya, without a green spot, far away to the horizon's verge; in the south appears the valley of the Nile, like a thread of green earth lying on an ocean of sand, and the pyramids of Aboukir, Sakhara, and Darfour, towering up in succession to the skies. Turning northward, your eye rests upon the widespread Delta in the distance, and nearer, in the north-east, upon the lone obelisk of Heliopolis. Immediately before you rise the precipitous heights of Mount Mokattam, crowned with the citadel of Cairo, under which lies the ancient city, enveloped in a thin vapor, which just suffices to hide the deformities of the place, while a thousand domes and minarets, of graceful proportions, their gilded crescents glittering in the sunbeams, rise up to complete the vision of beauty. I turned from gazing on it to look upon the rocky plain immediately around the pyramid. There, deeply buried in the rock, now covered with sand and rubbish, lie the dead of four thousand years ago. It is, indeed, a vast necropolis. It seemed as though I were among the earliest born of men. From the plains before me had gone forth the elements of science, art, and wisdom, to Greece, to Europe, to America. I felt as a child, born after unnumbered generations, returned to the home of his ancestors, and behold! it was all desolate."—Vol. i, p. 53.

Dr. Durbin subscribes to the opinion now generally entertained, that these immense structures were built for the mausoleums of the ancient kings of Egypt. Their position "in the midst of a vast cemetery, the fact that sarcophagi have been found in them," and their total unfitness for any other conceivable purpose, render this hypothesis altogether probable. But why such vast expense in providing indestructible mausoleums? We are hardly content with that modification of Pliny's opinion, which our author seems to approve, and which supposes that they were designed to perpetuate the memory of the monarchs who built them. The researches of Rosellini furnish a solution of the problem, which, to our mind, is more satisfactory. According to the learned Italian, the religion of the ancient Egyptians taught that the soul, after a long series of transmigrations through the bodies of animals, would revisit and reanimate its original human form. But if the body which it last inhabited were suffered to decay, the course of the metempsychosis was interrupted, and the return of the soul to its higher state was prevented or delayed. We quote from memory, but believe that we have given the substance of the doctrine as stated by the Italian professor. If this belief actually prevailed among the Egyptians, we have the key to the mystery of their excessive carefulness to preserve the dead—men, crocodiles, mummy-birds, and all—and of the construction of pyramids for the security of the earthly tenements which they hoped again to inhabit.

Before taking leave of Egypt Dr. Durbin devotes a chapter to the history, character, and government of Mehemet Ali. This is one of the best-written portions of the book; brief, clear, and accurate; evincing a discriminating judgment, and a just appreciation of the merits and demerits of that remarkable man and "useful tyrant." We attempted to condense this chapter into a form suited to our present article, but found its elasticity so great as to resist our efforts to compress it. We commend it to the careful perusal of that class of persons who, dazzled by the achievements of this despot, and by the improvements which he has introduced, neglect to examine the only infallible test of a ruler's claim to admiration—the condition of the people whom he governs. The pacha is undoubtedly a great man in his way; but his system of political economy is the most execrable ever carried out in practice. It paralyzes industry, drains the wealth and life-blood of the country, exhausts the fountains of prosperity, and reduces the mass of the population to misery and despair. His government is not only the most arbitrary of despotisms, but a despotism exclusively and intensely selfish. So far from consulting the interest or happiness of his people, he blindly sacrifices both to his own schemes of ambition and avarice; forgetting the wisest maxim of a far-seeing statesmanship, that the interests of governor and governed are one and inseparable.

Under the guidance of Tualeb, sheikh of the Tawaras, Dr. Durbin and his companions departed from Cairo, and went through Wady et Tih, and the defile south of Gebel Atakah to Wady Tawarik and the Red Sea. As he is the first American traveler who has taken this route, we have followed him with much interest. On the second day he journeyed for several hours through a remarkable locality of petrifactions, which has been named by travelers the "petrified forest," though Wilkinson denies the appropriateness of the appellation. A short extract will show that Wilkinson is in error:—

"As far as the eye could reach, the whole country was literally covered with a petrified forest, lying just as the timber had fallen. The appearance of the whole was natural in the extreme. The spectacle reminded us strongly of a clearing in one of our western forests, where countless trunks and fragments of trees cover the ground in confusion. In many cases the form of the roots and limbs is perfectly preserved; the knots and the texture of the wood are visible; and we could even determine what part of the tree was unsound or wormeaten at the time of the petrifaction. The trunks, some of which were three feet thick and eight yards long, were generally broken transversely into sections of from one to three or four feet in length. The color of

the wood was mostly dark brown, and its texture very close. When struck, it gave a ringing sound like cast iron."—Vol. i, p. 93.

Our author discusses, at some length, the question of the exode of the Israelites, and suggests, as we have already stated, a new hypothesis. With a good map of Egypt before him, (we use Robinson's,) the reader can easily trace the routes proposed by different writers. Sicard and Shaw lead them in a circuitous course round the western slope of Mount Mokattam, by the Persian Babylon, and thence to the Red Sea, through the same valleys and gorge which Dr. Durbin passed through. Niebuhr, Burckhardt, and Robinson contend for the nearest route from the land of Goshen to the western arm of the Red Sea, and suppose that the miraculous passage was made near the site of the modern town of Suez. Dr. Robinson suggests that Etham, where the people made their second encampment after they left Rameses, "may have stood upon or near the strip of land between the gulf and the basin of the bitter lakes." At Etham, Moses commanded them to "turn" and "encamp by the sea;" and "they marched down the western side of the arm of the gulf to the vicinity of Suez." Dr. Durbin agrees with Robinson and Hengstenberg that the land of Goshen lay upon the Pelusiac arm of the Nile, that Rameses was at the place now called Abu Keisheid, and that the court of Pharaoh was at Tanis, the ancient Zoan; but supposes that Etham "was not far from the water-shed between the Nile and the gulf of Suez, in the neighborhood of Gebel Aweibid." Here, according to Dr. Durbin, in order that Pharaoh might pursue them to his own destruction, "Israel turned to the right, and, advancing southward, passed up the Besatin road to the west of Gebel Atakah, and then bearing east, and passing between Gebel el Gharboun and Gebel Atakah, came into the open country which declines gently to the south-east into the valley of Ramleyeh." If Robinson's map is accurate as to the positions of Atakah and Gharboun, there is some inaccuracy in the language here used by Dr. Durbin; for, passing between these two mountains, Gharboun on the right and Atakah on the left, they would not bear east, but south, and would begin to bear east only when they came into the open country.

From the valley of Ramleyeh, then, they passed through the narrow gorge between Mount Atakah and Mount Dereg (Shaw's road of Israel) to the Wady et Tawarik, where they made their third encampment. At this place the sea is about ten miles wide, and much deeper than at Suez, and here Dr. Durbin, as well as Dr. Olin, insist that the miraculous passage was made. Both

these gentlemen argue with much ingenuity that the localities here accord better with the narrative of Moses, than those at Suez. Dr. Olin, however, has proposed no hypothesis as to the way the people came to this valley.

The problem is beset with difficulties; and, as Dr. Durbin justly remarks, "the most we can reach in regard to it is a balancing of probabilities." It is clear to our minds that whatever route the children of Israel took, more than three days must have intervened between the morning after the passover and the night in which they crossed the sea. Pharaoh did not think of pursuing the fugitives till they had turned out of their way on the morning of their departure from Etham. Now it was equally impossible, whether his court was at Zoan or Memphis, for the news of the apparent mistake to reach him, and for him to muster his army and overtake them on the evening of the same day at their encampment at Pihahiroth. Had he had a railroad and locomotives, and the military celerity of Napoleon to boot, he could hardly have accomplished this. Besides, we are told that a pillar of cloud led the people by day, and by night a pillar of fire, "to give them light, *to go by day and by night*." We are not obliged, therefore, to restrict them to three days because they made but three regular encampments. Dr. Durbin has presented this point in a clear light, and shown that the part of Dr. Robinson's argument which rests on the "three days'" hypothesis, is not entitled to much weight.

There are grave objections, however, to the route proposed by Dr. Durbin, and to the supposition that the passage of the sea was made at Wady Tawarik. Of these he intimates that he is not insensible. We have written out our views on the question, at some length, but finding that they would extend this article far beyond our prescribed limits, we are obliged to omit them for the present. The examination which we have been able to give the subject has constrained us to assent, in the main, to the views of Dr. Robinson; and to believe that the "probabilities" are strongly against Dr. Durbin's hypothesis.

On the arrival of our traveler at Horeb he was courteously received by the superior of the convent, and kindly treated during his sojourn. Of course, he had to listen to the usual number of legends, credible and incredible, as the monks conducted him to the various traditionary localities about the Holy Mountain. It is their policy to place in the vicinity of Sinai nearly all the wonders that occurred in the wanderings of Israel. The holy fathers appear to love money as well as their Arab neighbors; and the

more curious or credulous the pilgrim, the richer their harvest. Dr. Durbin, however, is not the man to devour indigestible traditions. He rejects the Sinai of the monks, (Gebel Mousa,) and adopts the Sinai of Dr. Robinson. This learned antiquary first announced to the world that Suksafeh is the only summit of the Horeb group which corresponds to the circumstances mentioned by Moses. Dr. Olin afterward came to the same conclusion, and the opinion is now confirmed by Dr. Durbin in the following passage, which does equal honor to his head and heart:—

"It was three miles from our position on Gebel Mousa to the summit of Suksafeh, (Sinai on the map,) which overlooks the plain El-Rahah. It took us three hours, with great fatigue and some danger, to reach it. No one who has not seen them can conceive the ruggedness of these vast piles of granite rocks, rent into chasms, rounded into smooth summits, or splintered into countless peaks, all in the wildest confusion, as they appear to the eye of an observer from any of the heights. But when we did arrive at the summit of El-Suksafeh, and cast our eyes over the wide plain, we were more than repaid for all our toil. One glance was enough. We were satisfied that here, and here only, could the wondrous displays of Sinai have been visible to the assembled host of Israel; that here the Lord spoke with Moses; that here was the mount that trembled and smoked in presence of its manifested Creator! We gazed for some time in silence; and when we spoke, it was with a reverence that even the most thoughtless of our company could not shake off. I read on the very spot, with what feelings I need not say, the passage in Exodus which relates the wonders of which this mountain was the theatre. We *felt* its truth, and could almost see the lightnings and hear the thunders, and the 'trumpet waxing loud.'

"I had stood upon the Alps in the middle of July, and looked abroad upon their snowy empire; I had stood upon the Appenines, and gazed upon the plains of beautiful Italy; I had stood upon the Albanian Mount, and beheld the scene of the Æneid from the Circean promontory, over the Campagna, to the eternal city and the mountains of Tivoli; I had sat down upon the Pyramids of Egypt, and cast my eyes over the sacred city of Heliopolis, the land of Goshen, the fields of Jewish bondage, and the ancient Memphis, where Moses and Aaron, on the part of God and his people, contended with Pharaoh and his servants, the death of whose 'firstborn of man and beast in one night' filled the land with wailing; but I had never set my feet on any spot from whence was visible so much stern, gloomy grandeur, heightened by the silence and solitude that reign around, but infinitely more by the awful and sacred associations of the first great revelation in form from God to man. I felt oppressed with the spirit that seemed to inhabit the holy place. I shall never sit down upon the summit of Sinai again, and look upon the silent and empty plains at its feet; but I went down from the mount a better man, determined so to live as to escape the terrible thunders at the last day, which once reverberated through these mountains, but

have long since given way to the gospel of peace. I could scarcely tear myself away from the hallowed summit, and wished that *I too* could linger here forty days in converse with the Lord."—Vol. i, pp. 143–145.

At Akabah our traveler parted with his Tawara guides, and engaged a party of Sheikh Hussein's Alouins to conduct him to Hebron. The character of the Arabs of the desert seems to have improved of late; for Dr. Durbin found them uniformly good-natured, obliging, and faithful. How far the liberal proposal of Tualeb to give him the youthful Ghebeleyeh for a wife may have warped his judgment we have no means of determining; but the accounts of former travelers have not given us a very exalted idea of Bedouin manners or honesty. The old sheikh's offer proves at least that he and his pilgrim were on cordial terms with each other, and that the former thought he had discovered in the latter the right material for a very passable Mussulman; for a wife twelve years old, with a sheikship in expectancy for a dowry, is no every-day windfall.

We have no reason to doubt that the conduct of the Arabs is better than formerly in their intercourse with travelers, and are at no loss to account for the improvement. The fear of Mehemet Ali certainly has strong influence over them; but this is not all. The progress of civilization and commerce has established this very practical truth—that more money is to be made by cheating men than by robbing them; and somehow the children of the desert have got an inkling of this. They regard travelers as so much stock in trade, which is to be disposed of so as to yield the highest possible percentage; and from Dr. Durbin's liberal disbursement of *buksheesh*, they doubtless considered him an investment worth looking after. Kindness, too, will soften the temper even of the wild Ishmaelite; and our traveler had the good sense not to trample on the toes of men who have heavy heels, and power to use them. His tact and skill stood him well in hand in bargaining at Akabah, where he had occasion for all his resources. Hussein is evidently a lion among sheikhs, and has so far caught the spirit of the age as to be a fair exponent of the commercial code of morals. He stands on his dignity as loftily as any "merchant prince" in New-York or Boston, and is *au fait* at driving a hard bargain according to the most approved tactics of the craft. Many a luckless pilgrim, after listening to the propositions of the wily chief, made with the most deliberate and business-like coolness, has felt too sensibly that not even "pipes and coffee" would save him from extortion, and that it was useless to haggle with the lion about the price of a safe-conduct out of his den. It was reserved for the transatlantic

stranger to prove himself a match for the "desert king" in a tournament with his own weapons, where the latter certainly had the advantage of the ground.

Passing up Wady Arabah, which extends from Akabah northward to the Dead Sea, our author visited the tomb of Aaron on Mount Hor, and the ruins of Petra "among the clefts of the rocks." This long-lost city, brought to light by Burckhardt in 1812, and since described by Stephens, Laborde, and others, was once a commercial depot between the east and the west, and the Arabah was the great highway of oriental trade. Dr. Durbin suggests that a ship-canal from Akabah to the Dead Sea through this valley, to be met at some convenient point by a railway from Jaffa, may, at a future day, restore commerce to its ancient route. He also suggests that a railway from Akabah through the valley to Kadesh, and thence to Jaffa, is more practicable than from Suez to Cairo, or to the Mediterranean. We perceive no objection to the latter proposition, and think it probable that English capital and enterprise will ere long make the hills of Idumea echo the panting of locomotives, and frighten the gazelles of Mount Seir with the discord of the steam-whistle. As to the former suggestion, a single word will suffice. A canal must be fed by an unfailing supply of water at its summit level. This is as absolute a *sine qua non* as a fulcrum to the lever of Archimedes. What stream or reservoir exists at the water-shed in the Arabah to supply, at all seasons of the year, the evaporation and waste of a ship-canal?

We now hasten to meet our traveler at Jerusalem, necessarily omitting, on our way thither, many interesting matters which will gratify and instruct the readers of his volumes. The chapters which describe the Holy City and the localities around it will probably be read with more intense interest than any other part of the book by a large class of persons. Jerusalem is the *sacred city* of Christians. Every spot in and about it is consecrated in the history of God's ancient people, and hallowed by the Saviour's presence, or sufferings, or triumphs. It has been the theme of our contemplation from earliest childhood, and the associations connected with it are not only the most cherished of our lives, but are common both to the learned and the unlearned. Dr. Durbin apprises us that he will not "go into a topographical or antiquarian description, but will present as clear an account as possible of what he saw himself." For this we thank him; and for this we believe the great majority of religious readers will thank him. We have had about enough of learning and disquisition on these topics, and are glad to get at the plain matters of fact. We assure the reader

who may wish to find a clear, concise, and trustworthy account of the Holy City as it is, unincumbered by ambitious "discoveries," and undeformed by pedantry, that Dr. Durbin's "Walks about Jerusalem," which occupy only about eighty-five pages of his work, will furnish him precisely what he wants. If he will retrace these "Walks" with the aid of the accurate plans which illustrate them, he will obtain more real and available knowledge, than he can acquire with double the time and labor from works of much greater pretensions.

We must leave it for the author to conduct his readers over Moriah, Akra, and Zion; through the valleys of Gihon, Hinnom, and Jehoshaphat; to the Tombs of the Judges, Kings, and Prophets; to the site of the Temple of Solomon, to the Pool of Siloam, the Mount of Olives, and the Garden of Gethsemane.

Dr. Durbin had but a peep at the area of the temple which is now partly occupied by the great Mosque of Omar, and which is too sacred for Christian or Jewish feet to enter. This gap in his observations is filled up with extracts from the pen of Mr. Catherwood, who had the good fortune to outwit the Mussulman, and who made the best use of his opportunities by examining the whole ground, and taking drawings of the edifices.

The most attractive place in the city for pilgrims who believe its traditions is the church of the Holy Sepulchre. From the time when the crusaders, under Godfrey, took the city by assault, and ran, reeking with blood, to prostrate themselves and melt into tears around "the place where the Lord lay," down to the present moment, when the toil-worn and barefooted pilgrim is kneeling to kiss a greasy slab of marble, or worship a tawdry picture, and expending his last piastre in rosaries, amulets, and other pious trinkets which have received a mysterious virtue by contact with the tomb of Jesus,—to visit the spot of the crucifixion and resurrection, has been the end and aim of the millions who have flocked to the Holy City. The following passage shows that Dr. Durbin's visit to the "reputed sepulchre" did not tend to confirm his faith in its identity with the real place of our Lord's death and burial.

"To visit this spot had been one of the earliest dreams of my youth; the impression which a perusal of Chateaubriand at that early period made upon my mind followed me through successive years. A subsequent reading of the journals of less ardent and less credulous travelers should, perhaps, have corrected these impressions, but they did not; my judgment was convinced for the time being, but the earlier visions of the imagination always triumphed over the convictions of reason. It remained for the painful revelations of a personal visit to the reputed

sepulchre—the monstrous absurdities of an unreasoning tradition, the frauds and impositions of a corrupted religion, the degradation and debasement of credulous pilgrims, the strifes between contending factions, all professing Christianity, and all unworthy of the name—to banish for ever the dreams of my youth, and to correct whatever tendency to superstition might have existed in my imagination."—Vol. i, p. 297.

We have been accustomed to consider the argument of Dr. Olin, who agrees with Chateaubriand, as the most skillfully put of any that we have seen in favor of the tradition. But awarding him due praise both for his dialectics and his faith, we must still confess our skepticism in regard to the locality. Dr. Durbin has given a concise statement of Dr. Robinson's argument on the other side of the question, and of his own reasons for coinciding with his views. The reader will find the whole pith of the matter condensed into five pages. Our author shows first, that the tradition is defective in continuity, not extending back further than the fourth century; and secondly, that the topography of the place is irreconcilable with the statement of the evangelists, and therefore invalidates the tradition. The four evangelists all strongly intimate that Golgotha was *without* the city, and the topographical argument proves that the site of the traditionary sepulchre was *within* the city at the time of the crucifixion, and therefore could not have been the locus of that transaction.

The question of the "restoration of the Jews" is ably discussed in the closing chapter of the first volume. We present only a summary of the author's conclusions without attempting either to sustain or controvert them. He adopts that interpretation of the prophecies which declares that the Jews, scattered abroad in all nations, shall be converted to Christianity, and that they shall return to Palestine in sufficient numbers to constitute a permanent political state. He does not suppose that their previous conversion to Christianity is a necessary condition to their restoration; nor that Christ will appear in person at Jerusalem as their king. He gives Millerism its quietus by proving that the second advent cannot precede the restoration of the Jews. He shows that the conversion of the Jews will contribute incalculably to the universal diffusion of Christianity among the Gentiles, by preparing an army of evangelists which shall start up among all nations, and proclaim to them in their own language the wonderful works of God. For this mission they are peculiarly fitted by their great numbers, their facilities of intercommunication, the extent of their dispersion, their unity, their sympathy, their religious zeal, their

hatred to idolatry, and their literary and political, as well as commercial influence throughout the world. He next points out the signs of the times which indicate the near approach of the conversion and restoration of Israel. These are first, the present state of the Jewish mind, which, by the pursuit of liberal studies, is assimilating to that of Christian Europe, and which tends to falter in the hope of a Messiah to come. Next, the altered sentiments of Christian nations and churches toward the Jews, as exemplified in the protection now afforded to their persons and property, in the removal of their civil disabilities, and in the kindly efforts which churches and people are making to promote Christianity among them. Next, the present state of Palestine, in which the Mohammedan population is diminishing, and the Christian and Jewish population is increasing. Finally, the condition of the Turkish empire, which is crumbling to decay, and must shortly fall to pieces. The chapter will suggest to the Christian and philanthropist many subjects for earnest and profound reflection.

We pass over the excursion to the Dead Sea, as also the journey from Jerusalem to Beyrout. The reader must not infer from our omission that this part of the book is deficient in interest: for Jericho, the Jordan, and the sea of Sodom; Jacob's well and Samaria; Hermon, Tabor, and Carmel; Nazareth, Acre, Tyre, and Sidon,—all abound in Scriptural and historical recollections; and are noticed by the author with his usual good judgment and accuracy.

The chapters which describe the trip from Beyrout across Mount Lebanon to Damascus and Baalbec are full of valuable information, particularly in regard to the Maronites and Druses, whose recent wars of extermination have attracted the attention of the civilized world. We select a few particulars from this very instructive part of the work.

Secure in their inaccessible fastnesses, the mountaineers of Lebanon have remained free in the midst of despotism, and prosperous in the midst of decay. They are divided into many tribes and sects, among which the Maronites are the most numerous. These are Roman Catholics, and are governed by a patriarch who claims to be the successor of the apostles in the see of Antioch. They are remarkable for a blind submission to their spiritual guides, and for a fierce and persecuting spirit. Though they acknowledge the ecclesiastical supremacy of the pope, their usages conform more closely with the Greek than the Latin Church.

After the Maronites, the Druses are the most powerful sect in Lebanon, and are a most singular people. Our author describes

their religion as "neither Pagan, Mohammedan, Jewish, nor Christian; but a motley combination of the worst elements of them all." He also gives us an epitome of their peculiar doctrines, and a specimen of their catechism, from the Foreign Quarterly. These people have lately, on several occasions, manifested a desire to be instructed in Protestant Christianity; but their Maronite neighbors have as often interfered by arms and violence to prevent it. This has been the cause of those disastrous wars, which, within a few years, have desolated the mountain, and well nigh ruined both parties. After several fruitless applications to the British government for protection, they "threw themselves into the arms of the Moslems, and for the first time received Turkish schools, and instruction in the principles of the Koran." If the influence of England with the Sublime Porte could obtain the toleration of Protestantism in the Turkish empire, the Druses would readily embrace it, and a wide door for Christian enterprise would thus be opened in the East. Strong political motives may induce England to attempt to form ecclesiastical relations with these people; and the establishment of the diocese of St. James at Jerusalem may be the first step in a series of measures which will ultimately secure to her a predominant influence in the affairs of the East, and tend to the diffusion of a pure and elevated form of Christianity in that quarter. In these chapters, as in other portions of the work, Dr. Durbin occasionally makes remarks which evince a clear insight into the labyrinth of European politics, and a comprehension of the hidden springs of policy which regulate the movements of the "Great Powers" in all questions relating to the East. Indeed, the book generally will prove no less instructive to the politician and statesman, than to the scholar and Christian.

Dr. Durbin awards merited praise to the American missionaries in Syria, for their devoted labors among the mountaineers. Though opposed by the Greek bishop and clergy, they have cast bread upon the waters, which may be found after many days.

In the course of his travels, our author had frequent opportunities to observe the regularity and devoutness of the Mohammedans in their daily worship. The volatile Greek, even at public service, hurries through the mummeries of his church with scarcely the semblance of gravity; but the sober Turk, at the stated hours of prayer, wherever he may be, abstracts himself at once from surrounding objects, performs the customary prostrations, and ejaculates the prescribed formulas of his devotion with a conscientiousness which might teach Christians a lesson. An illustration of this occurred on the passage from Beyrout to Smyrna.

"But such a deck! It was literally covered from stem to stern by two hundred and eighty hadjis, or pilgrims, returning from the holy cities. They were divided into small squads, each surrounded by its furniture. Some lay on mats, some on carpets, others on rich cushions, and not a few upon the hard boards. The women were hid behind piles of provision-sacks, water-pots, saddle-bags, and what not, or were half suffocated under quilts hung over them for concealment. The waves soon began to break over the deck, and torrents of rain to fall. I watched one of the proudest of the Turks: his magnificent turban soon lost its fair proportions, and stuck to his head like a shapeless scull-cap; his venerable beard, thoroughly drenched, lay matted down upon his breast; but, amid it all, he continued, with the utmost composure, to smoke his pipe until it was drowned out, and then took his pocket compass, found the direction of Mecca, turned his face thither, and patiently performed his devotions amid the general confusion around him. During the whole voyage I heard not a murmur from any of them, nor witnessed a single instance of ill-blood, or even of disagreement. Half a dozen of the richer ones at last took refuge in the cabin; yet they did not eat with us, but spread their carpets on the floor, and sat cross-legged each at his own meal. At stated times during the day they turned their faces toward Mecca, by aid of compass, and performed their devotions as their brethren on deck. Their general deportment was grave and becoming, and they delighted to be addressed by the title of *hadji*, or pilgrim. The number of pilgrimages to Mecca is said to be decreasing annually, probably from the want of money as well as the decline of faith."—Vol. ii, pp. 101, 102.

Our traveler's course from Smyrna lay over Mount Pagus, and across the Cayster, to Ephesus; thence up the Cayster to Philadelphia; over Mount Tmolus to Sardis on the "golden Pactolus;" across the valley of the Hermus to Thyatira; and thence over Mount Temnus, and down the valley of the Caicus to Pergamus. He mentions a fact of much scientific interest in relation to the geology of this part of Asia Minor. The valleys of this region are connected with each other by narrow extensions between the mountains, somewhat, as we imagine, like the avenues of a vast labyrinth. Noticing the resemblance between these insulated mountains and the lofty islands in the neighboring sea, he says,—

"Taken together, they form one system, of volcanic origin, the only difference being that the islands are surrounded by water, and the mountains by connected valleys. Once they were all islands, but by the general elevation of the continent, the sea was drawn away from the bases of the mountains, and what was once its bottom became the rich valleys of Asia Minor."—Vol. ii, p. 120.

We have already alluded to our author's account of his journey in Asia Minor, and his visit to the 'Seven Churches," as exceed-

ingly interesting and attractive. This part of his book has all the freshness of novelty, and contains many passages of great beauty and eloquence. Some of the descriptions are full of spirit and vivacity; while others are tinged with an air of solemnity and sadness such as a man of sensibility would naturally feel as he treads upon the haunted ground which was once the garden of the world, but now a vast necropolis. A tone of deep, religious feeling pervades these chapters; and is, indeed, manifested on all suitable occasions throughout the entire work. We have space for only one or two extracts.

"Ephesus affords one of the most striking instances of the mutability of human affairs, and perhaps of the fulfillment of divine predictions, that can be found in history. Her wealth, in the old pagan times, rivaled, if it did not exceed, that of any of the Grecian cities of Asia; in the arts, her name was connected with the renown of Parrhasius and Apelles; in architecture, she far outstripped all her rivals. Her splendid temple, which required the wealth of Asia, collected for centuries, for its creation, was the wonder of the world; and around its sacred inclosures the Persian, the Lydian, the Greek, and the Roman, in turn bowed as worshipers. Nowhere in the world did the old idolatry display so much pomp and magnificence; nowhere did it press into its service with so much success the highest powers of human art. But it was not only in the palmy days of paganism that Ephesus was glorious. The visits of Paul, the preaching of Apollos, the ministry of Timothy, the faith and patience of the first converts to Christianity,—these, and a thousand other recollections, make the early Christian days of Ephesus glorious in the annals of the church. And even after the lessons of Paul and Timothy had been forgotten, and the 'first love' of the Ephesian church had waned, the city was still the seat of Christianity, and the chosen place of assembly for her bishops, her synods, and her councils.

"But all this glory has departed. 'Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write,' was the message of Christ by his servant John: 'Remember, therefore, from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do thy first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of its place, unless thou repent.' It was not long before the candlestick was removed. For a few centuries the church of Ephesus was powerful; but in that period, error and superstition on the part of the people, combined with and fostered by worldly-mindedness and ambition on the part of the lordly prelates who sat in the place of Timothy, Onesimus, and John, prepared the way for its destruction. The Christian history of Ephesus may be said to have ended with the sixth century; since that period it can hardly be said that the church has existed there at all; and now, there is neither angel nor candlestick in the once flourishing city. From the ruins of her theatre, the scene of noble martyrdoms, from the broken columns and scattered sculpture of her temples, from the desolation of her once-

peopled plain and terraced hills, a voice, audible enough to those who will listen, proclaims, 'He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.' "—Vol. ii, pp. 130, 131.

In the account of Philadelphia, after citing the words of Christ, through John the revelator, to that church, the author thus remarks on the faithfulness with which the divine promise has been kept:—

"The promise of divine interposition in the hour of temptation is the distinguishing feature in this letter of Jesus to the Philadelphians; and wonderfully has it been fulfilled for the last eighteen hundred years. The candlestick has never been removed; the angel of the church has always been there. The altar of Jesus has been often shaken, both by the imperial pagan power, when Philadelphia supplied eleven martyrs as companions to Polycarp in the flames at Smyrna, and by the arms of the false prophet, when Bajazet and Tamerlane swept over Asia Minor like an inundation; yet it has never been overthrown. The crumbling walls of twenty ruined churches, and the swelling domes and towering minarets of a dozen mosques, attest the hours of fiery temptation; yet three thousand Christian Greeks, and a half a dozen churches still kept in repair, and still vocal with praise to Jesus, attest that he has been faithful to his promise: 'I also will keep thee in the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth.' Ephesus is desolate, and without a Christian temple or altar; Laodicea is without inhabitant, except the foxes and jackals that prowl amid her circus and her theatres; Sardis is represented by one Turkish and one Greek hut; a handful of down-trodden Greek Christians worship in a subterranean chapel at Pergamos; but, in the language of Gibbon, 'Philadelphia alone has been saved by prophecy or courage. At a distance from the sea, forgotten by the emperor, encompassed on all sides by the Turks, SHE only among the Greek colonies and churches of Asia is still erect—a column in a scene of ruins."—Vol. ii, pp. 139, 140.

The lovers of Homer (and who that has read his magnificent epics does not love Homer?) will follow our traveler with delight over the "pine-covered and spring-nourishing Ida," and along the banks of old Scamander and Simois, and over the silent plain where *Troy was*. The tombs of Hector and Achilles still frown at each other across the desolate area which so often witnessed their heroism, as if their very dust were animated with undying hate. But here, as at other places which the busy memory of the pilgrim peoples with the shadows of the glorious past,

"Unmoved the Moslem sits, the light Greek carols by."

At the Dardanelles, Dr. Durbin took passage by steamboat to Constantinople, and entered the Golden Horn at sunrise. The

description of his approach to the Turkish capital is too fine a picture to be omitted.

"As the day dawned, the steward roused us; the boat got under way, and, sweeping round by Prince's Islands, headed to the city. The morning star glittered as a single diamond set in the calm, blue sky, and gradually disappeared in the soft light gushing up over the mountains of Asia. The first glimpse of the city disclosed the Seraskier's Tower, a strong, dark line on the kindling sky; in a few minutes appeared the six slender minarets of the Mosque of Sultan Achmet, and then the four of the venerable St. Sophia; and amid each group suddenly rose the dark mass of its swelling dome. As the glowing light rapidly spread over the heavens, other domes appeared upon the horizon, and their countless minarets, with rich, gilded pinnacles, pierced the plane of vision. The European coast was comparatively level, and beautifully green; dark mountain masses formed the Asiatic horizon, over which, as the sun came up, the sky impended as a canopy of molten gold.

"At first the city seemed one undistinguished mass; but, as we approached the Seven Towers, its parts gradually became distinct to the view. To the left, forming the background of the picture, the dark forests of cypresses indicated the resting-places of the dead of many generations. Directly before us the vast and complicated buildings of Seraglio Point unfolded themselves, crowned by St. Sophia just without the Sublime Porte, and ornamented with gardens of magnificent evergreens sloping down to the sea-wall. Approaching the Point, the months of the Bosphorus and Golden Horn opened before us, and yet appeared perfectly locked within the magnificent amphitheatre of cities formed by Scutari on the right, Galata, Tophanna, and Pera in front, and the city on the left. As we swept round Seraglio Point, the Golden Horn expanded before us, a broad, deep indentation, winding for miles between the city and its vast suburbs, and animated by ten thousand light, swallow-shaped caiques darting to and fro, and sitting as lightly on the waters as the flocks of seagulls that scarcely kept out of the way of their oars. Our anchor was quickly down, our luggage landed without custom-house examination, and we climbing the steep, narrow, rugged streets of Pera to Miserie's English hotel, where we once more found ourselves within the domain of European society and civilization."—Vol ii, pp. 185–187.

The "observations" made in this ancient city, and especially the notices of the social and moral condition of the different classes of its population, are lively and graphic. The religious creed and ceremonies of the Mohammedans are briefly explained; and the different postures of prayer illustrated by wood-cuts from Lane. A description is also given of the frantic exhibitions of the dervishes, whom our author calls "the monks of Moslemism." With the aid of the cuts, the reader will get an idea of their performances which will not be easily erased from his memory. There are two classes

of these fanatics, named, from the feats at which they are expert, the *howling* and the *dancing* dervishes. The *howler* plays wolf and hyena in holiest mood; and his brother, the *dancer*, spins out inspiration in dizzy spirals.

By means of a firman, obtained through the kindness of Mr. Brown, of the American legation, our author was permitted to visit the imperial mosques of Achmet, Suliman, and St. Sophia. The following extracts will convey a clear conception of these structures:

"The traveler in Asia Minor, and in the provinces near the capital, will notice the uniformity in structure of all the great mosques, which are distinguished by a principal centre dome, supported by two or more semi-domes at its base, with a greater or less number of lower domes or cupolas over the aisles and angles, according to the means of its founder and the magnificence of his plan. Thus an imperial mosque is a vast edifice between two and three hundred feet square, finished with a mountain of cupolas and domes, increasing in size as they ascend, and converging until the principal one, as a vast semi-globe, crowns the whole. These are all relieved by round or narrow windows, adorned by delicate tracery and fretwork cut in stone, which indeed spreads like network over most of the exterior of the domes and cupolas, each of which is surmounted by a gilded crescent that glitters in the sun. The Mosque of Achmet alone has more than thirty cupolas and domes. Each of the seven hills on which Constantinople is built, and of the heights on the opposite sides of the Bosphorus and Golden Horn, is crowned with one of these edifices, the more grand and imposing by reason of the elevation of nearly the whole mass of the building above the surrounding houses. It is this that makes the *coup d'œil* of Constantinople superior to any other city view on earth.

"Adjoining each mosque in front is a large court, several hundred feet square, around the sides of which, in the interior, run open arcades, covered by low, closed domes, with leaden roofs, and supported oftentimes by pillars of precious marble, the rare remains of the ancient city."

"At each corner of the court rises a slender minaret, which pierces the clouds like a gilded needle, and has two or three galleries of fine fretted stonework girding it at different heights. To these the muezzins ascend by interior spiral staircases, and call the people to prayers at the appointed times. The Moslems abhor bells, and hence the belfry of the church has given place to the minaret of the mosque; and the voices of a thousand muezzins, simultaneously proclaiming throughout the city, *There is but one God, and Mohammed is his prophet; come to prayers, come to salvation*, fall as agreeably on the ear of the Mohammedan as the chimes of the church bells on the ear of the Christian."

"Surprise, admiration, and awe are the first emotions which the stranger feels upon stepping into the mosque. The idea of vastness and vacuity predominates, and the impression is irresistibly made that the invisible God alone dwells here. The impression is deepened by

the gilded inscriptions proclaiming the fact from the cold stone walls, and the majestic dome impending at the height of two hundred feet over head. The quiet and reverence with which all present move over the flagged pavement, or prostrate themselves on mats or carpets, heighten the impression still more, and it is some minutes before the mind recovers itself sufficiently to notice and be offended at the minor details of the interior."—Vol. ii, pp. 202, 203, 204, 205.

Travelers have lavished a great deal of commiseration upon the beautiful Circassian and Georgian females who are offered for sale in the bazars of this city. It appears, however, from our author's statements, that all this sympathy is thrown away. These women are *in the market* by their own choice and the consent of their parents, and have been educated in view of becoming the wives of Turkish gentlemen who may happen to be rich enough to purchase and maintain them. Their matrimonial speculations generally turn out according to their wishes; and though the *modus operandi* of the bargain, sale, and transfer is somewhat different from the fashionable style in similar transactions among us, the same motive and principle lie at the bottom in both countries. Here, as well as there, the fascinating fortune-hunter anticipates "an improvement in her condition by being domesticated in the family of a rich man."

Two chapters are devoted to the history, condition, and prospects of the Turkish empire. The first presents a melancholy picture of the weakness of the government at home and abroad, the decay of trade, manufactures, and every branch of productive industry; and the appalling decrease of population. The second contains a history of the efforts of the present sultan to engraft upon the decaying trunk of Moslemism some of the vigorous shoots of Christian civilization. He has proposed a general reform in the laws for the security of property, liberty, and life; the establishment of a system of public instruction; and the creation of an imperial parliament. These prescriptions show the hand of a bold practitioner; but Dr. Durbin thinks the patient is too far exhausted to bear such vigorous treatment. The dissolution of the empire is retarded by the Great Powers of Europe, who are trying to keep the breath of life in it through sheer jealousy of each other, and dread of the scramble which will follow its last gasp.

The book closes with three chapters on "Christianity in the East." These have been prepared with the care and caution which the importance of the subject demands, and will be read with deep attention and solemn interest by every Christian and

philanthropist into whose hands the book may fall. The author believes that not less than fifteen millions of Christians of different sects are distributed, like leaven, through all parts of the Ottoman empire, and that their numbers and influence are steadily increasing. The Christian civilization of the West is also reacting upon the East, and is making itself felt and respected, not only in the palace of the Othmans, but in the remotest corners of the provinces. The proud Mussulman silently acknowledges its superiority, exclaims "God is great," and resigns himself to his destiny and his pipe.

In addition to these powerful elements of renovation, the Roman, Anglican, and American missionaries are prosecuting their work with untiring activity, though with widely different purposes and views. In giving the history of their operations Dr. Durbin steps upon delicate ground.

> "Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
> Tractas, et incedis per ignes
> Suppositos cineri doloso."

But having carefully examined the whole subject, he expresses his convictions with an independence which does honor to his character. He has stated with scrupulous fidelity what he believed to be truth, yet in such courteous phrase that even those who may take exceptions to his views will give him credit for gentlemanly delicacy and Christian candor.

We must now take leave of our traveler and his interesting volumes. In the language of oriental benediction, "May he live a thousand years;' and as often as he shall come to our table in the shape of a book, as elegantly illustrated and as readable as the present, so often we promise him a cordial greeting and a hearty welcome.

Carlisle, Nov. 15, 1845.

ART. VII.—*Sermons on Important Subjects.* By Rev. SAMUEL DAVIES, A. M., President of the College of New-Jersey. *With an Essay on the Life and Times of the Author*, by ALBERT BARNES. In 3 vols., 12mo., pp. 497, 556, 499. Second edition. New-York: Dayton & Saxton. 1843.

THE author of these volumes was a Congregational minister, and, in some respects, was a most remarkable man. As a pulpit orator, this country has furnished but few equals. For persevering industry and toil in his Master's service, he has left an example worthy the imitation of the pious in all ages. For great success in his labors, as a Christian minister, he was singularly successful. Few men, perhaps, in any age have been more highly honored, than was our author, in accomplishing the great objects contemplated in the Christian ministry.

President Davies was born on the 3d of November, A. D. 1724, in the county of Newcastle, state of Delaware. He was probably of Welsh descent. His father was a farmer, of great plainness and simplicity in his mode of living, but honest and pious. He died while Samuel (our author) was young. His mother was distinguished for her natural talents, and eminent piety. He was an only son, and a great favorite of his parents. His mother had long prayed for the bestowment of such a blessing, and when he was born, she could not but look upon him as a token of the divine favor, and given in express answer to her prayers. In writing to a friend, our author adverts to this fact, as follows:—"I cannot but mention an anecdote known to but few; that I am a son of prayer, like my namesake Samuel, the prophet; and my mother called me Samuel because, she said, I have asked him of the Lord." 1 Sam. i, 20. He was early dedicated to God by his parents, and this, he informs us, had a great influence on his mind in his early consecration to his Master's service. There being no school in the vicinity where his father resided, he was kept at home and taught by his mother; and such were his sprightliness, his propriety of conduct, and his remarkable progress in study, that when a boy he exhibited indications of great promise.

At the age of about ten years he was sent to an English school, at some distance from his father's house, where he continued two years, and made great proficiency in his literary acquisitions; although, during this period, partly for the want of proper religious instruction, he became somewhat careless as to his spiritual interests. He, however, attended to the duty of secret prayer, especially in the evening. The reason he assigns for this was, "he feared lest

he should die before morning." It is said, that he prayed ardently, about this time, that he might be "introduced into the gospel ministry," a calling to which his youthful mind seemed to have a strong predilection.

The precise time of his conversion is unknown, though it is supposed to have taken place when about twelve years of age. Being early dedicated to God by his parents, he was now led to consecrate *himself* to God, through faith in the atoning merit. For a time he was exercised with perplexing doubts respecting his divine acceptance but by constant prayer, and impartial and repeated self-examination, he obtained a satisfactory assurance of his adoption into the divine family, which he happily retained to the end of his life.

He was not favored with a collegiate education, though he was blessed with some of the advantages which the country at that time afforded for literary pursuits. His pecuniary means were limited; and this probably accounts for the fact of his not passing through a regular collegiate course. Being naturally endowed with an extraordinary intellect, and being ardently zealous to accomplish whatever he took in hand, he prosecuted his studies with astonishing success. All subjects within his investigations were mastered with apparent ease. By his indefatigable labors, his scholarship became quite extensive.

From what has been said, it appears that he early selected the Christian ministry as a calling for life. Whether the prayers and instructions of his parents had any influence on this early selection, is not necessary here to inquire At what age he entered upon his long-desired vocation is uncertain; though it is highly probable that he commenced his ministry when about twenty. At twenty-one, it is supposed that he was engaged as a minister, in a revival of religion in Virginia, an interesting account of which he gives in a letter to the Rev. J. Bellamy. In 1747, being twenty-three years of age, he was sent by the presbytery of Newcastle to Virginia, then a colony, and noted for profaneness and immorality. He preached to several congregations, which formed a kind of circuit, and in the discharge of his duties he was frequently under the necessity of traveling sixty miles. Such were his patience, perseverance, and piety, together with his powerful ministrations, that his labors were attended with great success. The "wilderness and solitary places" bloomed and blossomed before him. Many sinners were converted through his instrumentality, and among them were many slaves, who, no doubt, will furnish additional jewels in his "crown of glory."

Here he continued to labor until 1753, when he was chosen by the synod of New-York, at the instance of the trustees of New-Jersey College, as a suitable person to accompany the Rev. Gilbert Tennent* to England and Ireland, for the purpose of soliciting funds for said college. In this mission he was highly successful; and to his services, mainly, the college was indebted for its subsequent flourishing condition. In England he was greatly esteemed and beloved: his popular talents called forth great applause. While there, he formed an acquaintance with several distinguished gentlemen, with some of whom he continued to correspond till his death.

After his return to this country, he entered again upon the work of traveling his circuit in Virginia, preaching with success to his congregations until 1759, when he was elected president of the New-Jersey College. He succeeded the celebrated Jonathan Edwards, who entered upon the duties of the presidency of the college in 1758, and continued to discharge them but a brief period. In about two weeks after, he departed this life in hope of a "glorious immortality." President Davies entered upon his new calling with great zeal. Such had been the circumstances connected with his ministerial labors, that he had had but little opportunity for improvement in academical learning. He now applied himself with renewed energy to the studies necessary for a thorough qualification for so important and elevated a vocation. His success was great in his literary labors; and by his judicious management the college became very prosperous, and attained a high state of literary merit. But his intense application to study, together with his other labors, which were quite onerous, was more than his enfeebled constitution could endure. A change of exercise proved also undoubtedly disadvantageous to his health. He had been accustomed to much exercise in his long rides in Virginia, and now to confine himself to the duties of the college, merely walking from his own house to Nassau Hall, the distance of about ten rods, necessarily deprived him of his usual exercise—that exercise which the state of his health at that time demanded. He became exceedingly prostrated, and in Feb., 1761, he died of the inflammatory fever, in the thirty-seventh year of his age, having occupied the presidential chair of New-Jersey College about seventeen months.

* Gilbert Tennent was brother of the celebrated William Tennent. He labored in New-Brunswick, New-Jersey, and is said to have been a useful and popular preacher.

His death called forth much sorrow and lamentation in this country and in England. Several sermons were preached on the occasion. Dr. Finley, the successor of Mr. Davies in the presidency, preached from Rom. xiv, 7, 8: "*For none of us liveth unto himself,*" &c. The doctor remarks in his introduction, as a reason for selecting this passage, "When I reflect on the truly Christian, generous, yet strict catholicism that distinguishes this whole chapter, and how deeply it was imprinted on Mr. Davies' own spirit and influenced his course of life, I am ready to conclude, that, perhaps, no text could be more aptly chosen on the occasion." Dr. Gibbons, a distinguished divine, with whom Mr. Davies became acquainted on his visit to England, preached also an able sermon on the occasion from Eph. i, 11: "Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." The doctor gives a succinct view of the character of his honored friend, in which he represents him as one of the best men he ever knew; but some of his remarks in illustrating the doctrine of the text are strongly *Calvinistic.* The Rev. David Bostwick, M. A., has given a "just portraiture of President Davies," in which an analysis of his character is strikingly portrayed. Several others preached on the occasion, but it is not necessary that their productions should be noticed in this paper.

President Davies seemed to have been peculiarly fitted for the exigences of the times in which he lived. It was an age characterized by profligacy and vice; corruption of manners and a deep-rooted opposition to spiritual things had become exceedingly prevalent.* A large proportion of the people had become averse to experimental piety, and many who adhered to the "form," were destitute of the "power, of godliness." To meet the opposition, prejudice, and ignorance of such a period, required the first order of endowments. Such were pre-eminently possessed by our author. Like the Wesleys, he was evidently "fitted to his day." Mr. Bostwick describes him as being "adorned with such an assemblage of amiable and useful qualities, and each shining with such distinguished lustre, that it is hard to say in which he most excelled; and equally hard to mention one valuable or useful accomplishment in which he did not excel. A large and capacious understanding; a solid, unbiased, and well-regulated judgment; a quick apprehension; a genius truly penetrating; a fruitful invention; an elegant taste—were all happily united in him, and constituted a real great

* For the truth of this remark, see the Memoirs of the Tennents, who were his cotemporaries.

ness of mind which never failed to strike every observer with an agreeable surprise."

The reader has already been informed that his early advantages for an education were limited. By this circumstance, however, he was by no means discouraged. He thirsted after knowledge, not merely as an accomplishment, but as a means of extensive usefulness. His strength of genius and indefatigable application placed him in honorable standing among the first scholars of his age; and by the friends of education he was placed at the head of one of the first literary institutions of the country. Let those young preachers in the itinerant field, who are struggling under many embarrassments in acquiring a thorough education, remember that Davies did not become a scholar at once, but by patient perseverance in close application to study;—so of Franklin, who became a philosopher;—so of Newton, the astronomer;—so of Locke, the logician;—so of Clarke, the linguist. Education is usually purchased at the price which Jacob paid for his wives—years of faithful and incessant toil.

But as a Christian minister, our author particularly excelled. He loved the work, being satisfied that he had been called to it by the "Holy Ghost," and to it he unreservedly consecrated all the powers of body and mind. Feeling that the "love of Christ constrained" him, he went forth an itinerant minister, as did the apostles,

"To seek the wandering souls of men."

In the exercise of the ministerial functions, "his fervent zeal and undissembled piety, popular talents and engaging address, soon acquired for him a distinguished character, and general admiration. Scarce was he known as a minister but he was sent, on the earnest application of the people, to some of the distant settlements of Virginia, where many of the inhabitants, in respect of religion, were but a small remove from the darkness and ignorance of uncultivated heathenism; and where the religion of Jesus, which he endeavored to propagate, had to encounter all the blindness, prejudice, and enmity, that are natural to the heart of the most depraved sinner. Yet, under all apparent disadvantages, his labors were attended with such remarkable success, that all opposition quitted the unequal combat, and gave way to the powerful energy of the divine Spirit, which was graciously pleased by his ministry to add many new subjects to the spiritual kingdom of our glorious Immanuel."*

* Rev. Mr. Bostwick.

"The work of the ministry," says the author just quoted, "was Mr. Davies' great delight, and for which he was admirably furnished with every valuable qualification of nature and grace. Divinity was a favorite study, in which he made great proficiency for one of his years, and yet he generally preferred the most necessary and practical branches of it to the dark mazes of endless controversy and intricate disputes; aiming chiefly at the conversion of sinners, and to change the hearts of men by an affecting representation of the plain, but most important and interesting truths of the gospel. His talent for composition, especially for the pulpit, was equaled by few, and perhaps exceeded by none. His taste was judicious, elegant, and polite, and yet his discourses were plain and pungent; peculiarly adapted to pierce the conscience and affect the heart. His diction was surpassingly beautiful and comprehensive, tending to make the most stupid hearer sensibly feel, as well as clearly understand. Sublimity and elegance, plainness and perspicuity, and all the force and energy of language, were seen, to some extent, in all his writings. His manner of delivery, as to pronunciation, gesture, and modulation of voice, seemed to be a perfect model of the most moving and striking oratory.

"Whenever he ascended the sacred desk, he seemed to have not only the attention, but all the various passions of his auditory entirely at command. And as his personal appearance was august and venerable, yet benevolent and mild, so he could speak with the most commanding authority, or melting tenderness, according to the variation of his subject. With what majesty and grandeur, with what energy and striking solemnity, with what powerful and almost irresistible eloquence, would he illustrate the truths and inculcate the duties of Christianity! Mount Sinai seemed to thunder from his lips, when he denounced the curses of the law, and sounded the dreadful alarm to guilty sinners. The solemn scenes of the last judgment seemed to rise in view, when he arraigned, tried, and convicted, self-deceivers and hypocrites. And how did the balm of Gilead distill from his lips, when he exhibited a bleeding Saviour to sinful man, as a remedy for the wounded heart and guilty conscience! In a word, whatever subject he undertook, persuasive eloquence dwelt upon his tongue; and his audience was all attention. He spoke as on the borders of eternity, and as viewing the glories and terrors of an unseen world, and conveyed the most grand and affecting ideas of these important realities; realities which he then firmly believed, and which he now sees in the clearest light of intuitive demonstration."

The above may be viewed in the light of high-wrought pane-

gyric; but to what extent it may be thus regarded, we will not here decide. The representation was drawn by a personal friend, and how far the influence of friendship led to exaggeration, cannot be fully decided; charity, however, would prompt to a belief that the writer labored to give a faithful "portraiture" of his friend, as a Christian minister. And we are more inclined to this belief, from the fact that the representation agrees with those given by Drs. Finley, Gibbons, and others.

But to the volumes before us. These contain a large number of sermons on "important subjects," which were published after the author's death. Such was their rapid sale, that they soon passed through nine editions. They passed through several editions in England, and were sought after there with great eagerness by the religious reading community. Indeed, it is believed that no sermons of modern times have passed through more editions than have these, except those of Mr. Wesley. And though, perhaps, occasionally wanting in elegance of diction, and excessive in verbiage, yet they will be sought for and read when many others of more recent date shall have been consigned to oblivion. Dr. Gibbons, in the sixth London edition, speaks of them as follows:—

"A calm and elaborate inquiry into the connection of those passages which he chooses for his subjects, and a close investigation, when it appeared necessary, into the meaning of the text by consulting the original language, and fair and learned criticism;—a careful attention to the portions of sacred truth upon which he proposes to treat, so that his discourse as naturally rises from his theme as the branch grows from the root, or the stream issues from the fountain. In every page, and almost every line of our author's sermons, his readers may discover the subject he at first professed to handle; and he is ever illustrating, proving, or enforcing some truth evidently contained in it; observing a due regard to the divine word, by comparing and confirming Scripture by Scripture, by taking the sacred text in its easy and natural sense, and by pertinent citations of passages, both in the proof and amplification; an observance of method and order, so as to proceed, like a wise builder, in laying a foundation and regularly erecting the superstructure, and yet diversifying his method by making it sometimes open and express, and at other times indirect and implicit; a free, manly diction, without anything of a nice and affected accuracy, or a loud-sounding torrent of almost unintelligible words on the one side, or a loose negligence, or mean and low-creeping phrases, unworthy of the pulpit, on the other; a rich vein of evangelical doctrine with a proper notice of practical duties, or awful denunciation of divine wrath against the impenitent and incorrigible; an impartial regard to the cases of all his hearers, like a good steward distributing to all their portion in due season; animated and pathetic application, in which our author collects and concentrates what he has proved in his discourses; and urges it with

all the power of forcible address and melting persuasion to the heart." —Pp. 3, 4.

That the critic may find some objectionable things in the sermons before us is freely admitted; and that there are some sentiments in them that would be objected to by a large proportion of the readers of the Methodist Quarterly, is believed; for it should be remembered that the author of the sermons was a Calvinist, and that some of the peculiarities of his creed would naturally find a place in them; but notwithstanding all their objectionable features, we must be permitted to pronounce them as among the most eloquent and useful sermons ever issued by the American or English press. A few extracts from them must suffice.

In Sermon II, our author discourses on John iii, 16: "For God so loved the world," &c. It was preached immediately after he had recovered from a severe fit of sickness, and was introduced by the following remarks, which evidently show his ardent desire to benefit his hearers:—

"I have been solicitously thinking in what way my life, redeemed from the grave, may be of most service to my dear people. And I would collect all the feeble remains of my strength into one vigorous effort this day to promote this benevolent end. If I knew what subject has the most direct tendency to save your souls, that is the subject to which my heart would cling with peculiar endearment, and which I would make the matter of the present discourse.

"And when I consider I am speaking to an assembly of sinners, guilty, depraved, helpless creatures, and that if ever you are saved it will be only through Jesus Christ, in that way which the gospel reveals; when I consider that your everlasting life turns on this hinge, viz., the reception you give to this Saviour, and this way of salvation; when I consider these things, I can think of no subject more suitable for recommending the Lord Jesus to your acceptance, and to explain and inculcate the method of salvation through his mediation."—Pp. 31, 32.

In elucidating the subject, he notices at length the following points in his usual style, which, for *strength* and *simplicity*, is scarcely equaled by the celebrated Dr. South:—

"1. Without Christ, all are in a perishing condition.
"2. That through Christ, a way is opened for salvation.
"3. The grand prerequisite to being saved, is faith in Jesus Christ.
"4. That those who believe in Christ shall be saved.
"5. That this method of salvation is a most striking and astonishing display of the love of God."

Our author lived in an age in which infidelity was embraced by many, especially of the youth. Against it, he frequently leveled his artillery with great power and effect. In a sermon on the "*Divine Authority and Sufficiency of the Christian Religion*," he thus speaks of the religion of the Bible:—

"The religion of the Bible has the directest tendency to promote true piety and solid virtue in the world; it is such a religion as becomes a God to reveal; such a religion as we might expect from him; a religion intended and adapted to regulate self-love, and to diffuse the love of God and man through the world; a religion productive of every humane, social, and divine virtue, and directly calculated to banish all sin from the world; to transform impiety into devotion, injustice and oppression into equity and universal benevolence, and sensuality into sobriety; a religion infinitely preferable to any that has been contrived by the wisest and best of men."

Mr. Davies was a great lover of his country. In defense of its liberties, he appeared with all his zeal and eloquence. He preached on the occasion of his country's invasion by a foreign power. He gives the enemy no quarters. He fully believed in the efficacy and power of the gospel to triumph over the wickedness of this world, and that the time would come when the kingdom of the Redeemer would exercise its "government over our guilty race." His sermon on the "*Mediatorial Kingdom and Glories of Jesus Christ*," for sublimity of thought and true eloquence of expression, is hardly surpassed by any writer of ancient or modern times. But on the character of these sermons it is unnecessary that we should say more. The above will suffice for recommending them to the reader's attention. This was the principal object of the reviewer.

That the enterprising publishers have presented the public with a new and cheap edition of these sermons is a matter of thankfulness; and it is ardently hoped that they will still prove a great blessing to the ministry and to the church, and that they will continue to be read with increasing interest, delight, and profit, until time shall be no more! R. W. A.

New-London, Conn., Sept., 1845.

Art. VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments; translated out of the original Hebrew, and with the former Translations diligently compared and revised: and the Greek New Testament, printed from the Text, and with the various Readings of Knapp: together with the commonly-received English Translations. Designed for the Use of Students.* 4to. New-York: J. C. Riker, 129 Fulton-st. 1845.

In further explanation of the form and design of "The Student's Bible," it is only necessary to say, that the text occupies but a small part of the page, the remainder being ruled for the purpose of notes and criticisms. The paper is clear and firm, and admits of writing upon both sides without blotting. For those who study the Scriptures critically, and wish to note the results of their investigations, this Bible will be found a great convenience. We most heartily thank the publisher for thus furnishing our Biblical students with precisely what they want in this line; and we hope he may find ample encouragement in the enterprise. We feel a lively interest in efforts to put the Holy Scriptures into every desirable form; and we pray for a blessing upon those publishers who risk large outlays in endeavoring to carry out so desirable an object. They are especially entitled to the patronage of the Christian public, and we seriously hope our friend Riker will not fail to receive this reward.

---

2. *A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testaments and the Apocrypha.* By Patrick, Louth, Arnold, Whitby, and Lowman. A new edition, with the text printed at large, in four volumes. Phila.: Carey & Hart. New-York: Wiley & Putnam. 1845.

We noticed this important publication on the receipt of the first number. We are now happy to say that the whole is completed. As a commentary upon the entire Bible, this one has very few rivals. It is critical and thoroughly orthodox. But by this we do not mean to say that we subscribe to every line of this great work; but that, in general, it is a most excellent and safe guide to a better understanding of the Holy Scriptures. Whitby is thoroughly Arminian, and brings a vast amount of critical skill and argumentative power to the support of the true exposition of those portions of St. Paul's Epistles which are perverted by the Calvinistic commentators. He shows the theology and logic of Geneva no quarter, but dissects them, and exposes their radical deformities with the hand of a master. We most cordially recommend this great work to our preachers and people. Those who can

go beyond the commentaries of our own publication, ought by all means to furnish themselves with this. The work has long been exceedingly scarce and dear. Now, thanks to the American publishers, it can be had in royal 8vo., in a most beautiful style of execution, at a low price. We could wish every Methodist preacher, especially, might soon have a copy in his library.

---

3. *Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians.* By ALBERT BARNES. 12mo., pp. 331. Harper & Brothers. 1845.
4. *Notes, &c., on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.* By ALBERT BARNES. 12mo., pp. 355. Harper & Brothers. 1845.

So far as we have been able to examine these volumes, they sustain the well-earned reputation of the pious author, as an expositor of Holy Scripture. If we were to notice Mr. Barnes' faults as a popular commentator, we should mention, next to his doctrinal errors, that of prolixity. He seems not always to take time to condense his thoughts. The writing of a commentary upon the New Testament is a great work. One short life is scarcely enough for the object, and it is not a matter of wonder that a writer, who succeeds as Mr. Barnes has done, should press on to the conclusion as rapidly as possible. There is so great a want of a commentary upon the plan of Mr. Barnes' Notes, for the use of Bible classes and families, that we could wish to recommend these Notes without reserve. But unhappily we cannot do so. Mr. Barnes, after all his trouble with the General Assembly, is a high-toned Calvinist. Witness his notes on the first chapter of Ephesians. He makes out the fifth verse to contain the doctrine of personal and unconditional election to eternal life, and proceeds to a vindication of that doctrine. The following is a part of this vindication, and will give a good idea of the strain of his argument:—

"Who could worship or honor a God who had no plan, or purpose, or intention in what he did? Who can believe that the universe was formed and is governed without design? Who can doubt that what God *does* he always meant to do? When, therefore, he converts and saves a soul, it is clear that he always intended to do it. He has no new plan. It is not an after-thought. It is not the work of chance. If I can find out anything that God has *done*, I have the most certain conviction that he *always meant* to do it—and this is all that is intended by the doctrine of election or predestination."—P. 24.

So *those individuals* whom God finally saves, "he always meant" to save; and those whom he finally damns, "he always meant" to damn.

And yet God offers to those very men, whom "he always meant" to send to hell for ever, a free pardon of sin and eternal life! As says our commentator:—

"Suppose it should appear that while the executive meant, for wise but concealed reasons, to forgive a part, he had also determined to offer forgiveness to all."—P. 25.

And "suppose" he should "offer forgiveness" to those whom "he had always meant" to damn, surely this would be all fair enough, if it were done "for wise but concealed reasons!"

Again, upon verse 11, he comments thus:—

"*Of him who worketh all things.* Of God, the universal agent. The affirmation here is not merely that God accomplishes the designs of salvation according to the counsel of his will, but that *he does everything.* His agency is not confined to one thing, or to one class of objects. Every object and every event is under his control, and is in accordance with his eternal plan."—P. 31.

Now, this note is more ultra Calvinistic than that of any old Calvinistic commentator upon this place we have been able to find. The assembly of divines, Diodati, Beza, Henry, and others, in sense maintain that the text asserts what Mr. Barnes explicitly denies, viz., that "God *accomplishes the designs of salvation* according to the counsels of his own will." But Mr. Barnes would make the passage a universal proposition. He would make Paul affirm that *God does everything that is done in the wide universe*, and that all things which are done are "according to the counsel of his own will." What he says subsequently about "the laws of mind" only mystifies the subject a little, but does not remove the difficulty in the least. According to the note under consideration, God *is the only efficient agent in the universe.* He moves matter and mind by his own agency, and all the changes which the one or the other undergoes are in perfect accordance with his will. Where, then, is human responsibility? Is man to be responsible for what God does? And will the Judge assemble at his bar the whole world of mere passive instruments to render an account to him for what he will have done himself? This cannot be; for "the Judge of all the earth will do right."

But we did not intend, when we commenced this notice, to attempt an argument upon predestination and election. Our object was merely to exhibit the author's high-toned Calvinism. How far it is safe to introduce a work, so thoroughly spiced with the peculiar doctrines of the Geneva school, into our families and sabbath schools, we will not pretend to say. But we would most earnestly admonish those of our readers who use it, to be upon their guard in reading the Notes upon

those passages which are usually employed in support of the doctrines of predestination, election, perseverance, &c. Upon other portions of the New Testament the author casts much valuable light, and may be consulted to advantage.

---

5. *The Works of Isaac Barrow, D. D.: to which are prefixed the Life of the Author*, by Abraham Hill; *and a Memoir*, by James Hamilton. With the Notes and References carefully revised; and Indexes compiled expressly for this Edition. 3 vols., 8vo. New-York: John C. Riker. 1845.

Barrow's Works, by general consent, occupy a high grade among books of their kind. Of a school of divinity which distinguished an era in the English Church, they may be looked upon as the representatives of a large class of theological writings. The divinity of the times of the restoration and reign of Charles II. is noted for its low tone on evangelical subjects, and for greater attention to the outward parts of religion than to its inward spirit and life;—a defect to which, no doubt, Barrow's writings contributed. But apart from this, his Works have many excellences. His casuistry and practical moral instructions are valuable, and richly compensate a careful perusal. His Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy exhausts its subject, and leaves little more to be said or even desired by the friends of religious liberty. The scope of his argument is comprehensive, his style is nervous, and his reasoning conclusive; to read them without receiving instruction would argue either a very wise or a very dull understanding,—to dwell upon their instructions without being made better would indicate either very high previous attainments, or else great perversity of heart.

We hail with pleasure this first American edition of a valuable standard work, as indicative of an increasing spirit of inquiry and research into that class of writings. Truth has nothing to dread from free and full investigation; and we cordially commend these volumes to the curious in theological literature, though we would not indorse them as safe guides or correct standards of Christian doctrine in all cases. They afford, besides many intrinsic excellences, a striking view of the theology of the Church of England in one of its peculiar phases,—the point of departure from the simplicity of the gospel, upon its most erratic divergence into the frozen regions of formality and skepticism. By observing here the small beginnings of error, we may be admonished of like danger, and stimulated to contend more earnestly for the purity of the gospel. Much praise is due to the publisher of this edition, and we hope that he will meet with a corresponding liberality on the part of the public. The dimensions into which this edition is

compressed, its mechanical execution, and especially its *price*, commend it to public favor. A more extended notice of these works may be expected hereafter.

---

6. *Elements of Morality, including Polity.* By William Whewell, D. D. Harper & Brothers. 1845.

The author of this work is widely known by his History of the Inductive Sciences, as a philosophical writer of extensive investigation, of clear-sighted discrimination, and of great ability. In this book he has set forth the essential principles of morality and of polity, in all departments of thought and action, legal, social, and ecclesiastical. Of course we except to his views of the propriety of a connection between the church and the state.

The methodic arrangement of the work is one of its most marked features, and will greatly facilitate its use. It has been published in two very neat duodecimo volumes, and forms the opening number of a series of substantial works, to be published under the general title of Harper's "New Miscellany." The project deserves, and we doubt not will meet, a marked success.

---

7. *The Life of Faith, in three Parts; embracing some of the Scriptural Principles, or Doctrine of Faith, the Power or Effects of Faith in the Regulation of Man's inward Nature, and the Relation of Faith to the Divine Guidance.* By Thomas C. Upham. 12mo., pp. 480. Boston: Waite, Pierce & Co. 1845.

We did not receive this book sufficiently early to enjoy the privilege of its perusal before giving this notice. We anticipate much spiritual profit from the instructions which Professor Upham has imparted upon the great and important theme which constitutes the subject of his book. In the mean time we will allow the excellent author to speak for himself by inserting his short explanatory preface entire.

"Christianity harmonizes with itself, and involves in its progress the same great principles which characterize its incipient state. The Christian, therefore, lives as he began to live. He began in faith. He lives, day by day, in the exercise of faith. And, by the grace of God, he is ultimately made victorious, and is brought into the possession of the divine image, through the same faith.

"I have endeavored, in the following pages, to illustrate this great truth. The present work, therefore, is, to some extent, kindred in its nature with the interior life. And it is proper to say here, that it has been found necessary, in order to its completeness, to transfer to it, in a few instances, the statements and principles which are there given. I have particular reference in this remark to portions of the third and

twelfth chapters in Part I, and of the ninth chapter in Part II. The leading object of both works is the promotion of practical holiness. I have no doubt, that the object will meet with favor; but have less confidence, that the manner of executing it will be approved. But, however this may be, it is a satisfaction to know, that books, as well as other things, have their overruling Providence. And he who writes, as well as he who acts in other ways, can exercise a cheerful confidence in leaving what he has done with God, who can distinguish between the result and the intention, and can make even the weak and imperfect things of his people to praise him."

---

8. *The Philosophy of Mystery.* By WALTER COOPER DENDY, Fellow and Honorary Librarian of the Medical Society of London, &c. 12mo., pp. 142. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1845.

A VERY curious book, this. The author attempts to give us the philosophy of spectral illusions, supposed visions, strange dreams, somniloquence, somnambulism, &c. He brings to bear upon these recondite topics a vast amount of physiological knowledge, and makes the discussion exceedingly entertaining, though we cannot say that he always perfectly convinces us of the truth of his theories. The facts which he states are worth knowing, though we may not find connected with them a satisfactory explanation. The discussions are conducted in the agreeable form of a dialogue, and the style is easy and flowing. In an age when *miraculous things* are so acceptable to the public taste, we doubt not but this book will find readers. Upon the whole, such a book is much better than the wonders which are made out of whole cloth by our writers of fiction.

---

9. *The Roman Church and Modern Society. Translated from the French of Prof. E. Quinet, of the College of France.* Edited by C. EDWARDS LESTER. 12mo., pp. 198. New-York: Gates and Stedman. 1845.

THIS book is made up of lectures delivered by the author upon what he calls "Ultramontanism,"—which is the designation given to *Romanism* proper in distinction from the *Catholicism* of France and Germany. The author attempts to show the deleterious influence of Romanism upon the literature and civil institutions of Europe. He proves that philosophy and history have been crushed in Italy by the iron despotism of Rome; and that Italy has surrendered her nationality to the triple crown. His lecture on *Galileo* is peculiarly valuable. But there is in these learned and powerful lectures too much transcendental mistification for us. Moreover, the learned professor has too high a veneration for Voltaire, Rousseau, and others of the same school. Still, these lectures may be profitably read; we are glad to see them in an English dress.

10. *The Jesuits, translated from the French of* MM. MICHELET and QUINET, Professors in the College of France. Edited by C. EDWARDS LESTER. 12mo., pp. 225. New-York: Gates & Stedman. 1845.

THESE are the lectures which the Jesuits undertook to stifle in the birth, by raising tumults at the time of their delivery. But this time the serpent bit a file. The popular feeling was too strong against this dangerous and factious class of Romanists. The professors were sustained, and their assailants put down. The lectures of Michelet are not remarkable for sound logic, but are admirably calculated for popular effect. Those of Quinet are regular and finished structures, full of such terrible facts as Romanists wish to conceal. The translator tells us that these lectures passed through seven editions in eight months, and that more than two hundred volumes have been published for and against them. This shows at least the importance put upon them both by the friends and enemies of the professors. Undoubtedly, the labors of these distinguished men have contributed much toward the fall of the Jesuits in France. It is said this amphibious, nondescript race are now leaving France; but where will they go? Perhaps some of them will favor us with their presence and handy-help in managing our affairs. We hope this may not be so, for we have enough of them here already. Still a class of politicians say, "Pshaw! Jesuits? where are they? There are none of them here." So, many in Europe have continued to say, even while these insidious foes were undermining all the institutions of the country. Even Jesuits there often raised a hearty laugh, and exclaimed, "Nonsense! The Jesuits dangerous? They are things that were. Don't, gentlemen, attempt to frighten children with 'old wives' fables.'" Yes, we have Jesuits among us—and Jesuits are always the same. Their work is espionage, and their motto, "Death to liberty—liberty of conscience and liberty of speech." And this is none the less their work, though they shout, "Hurra for liberty! Long live the republic of America!"

---

11. *The Sufferings of Christ.* By a Layman. 12mo., pp. 328. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

THE doctrines of this book may be gathered from the opening of the author's Preface, which is as follows:—

"The prevalent theory of the redeeming sufferings affirms that God is impassible, and therefore limits the sufferings of Christ to his manhood alone. This theory has pervaded Christendom, and stood the test of centuries; yet have we been forced, by Scriptural proofs, to the conclusion that it is founded in error, and that the expiatory agonies of our Lord reached not only his humanity, but his very Godhead."

We have only been able to glance at a few pages of this singular production. The argument seems to have cost the author much thought, and he certainly prosecutes it with earnestness and vigor. We shall read the book when we have leisure, and should we think the interests of truth require a further notice of it, we shall again introduce it to our readers. Our *a priori* opinion of the work, we freely confess, is unfavorable. We stand in doubt of such speculations. The *doctrine* of atonement is clearly taught in the Scriptures, but as to the *rationale*, any further than it stands revealed in the Bible, it is scarcely a proper matter of speculation. Such speculations are generally attended by the disadvantage of enlarging unnecessarily the field of controversy with infidelity, and of at least seeming to create reasonable ground of objection to the cardinal doctrines of the gospel. We will not, however, prejudge the book before us. We will read it with care, and then discharge our conscience in relation to its contents.

---

12. *Introductory Lectures on Modern History, delivered in Lent Term*, 1842, *with the Inaugural Lecture, delivered in December*, 1841. By Thos. Arnold, D. D., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, and Head Master of Rugby School. Edited from the second London edition, with a preface and notes. By Henry Reed, M. A., Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania. 12mo., pp. 428. D. Appleton & Co. 1845.

This book is not so much occupied with historical details as with the principles to be called into requisition in their perusal and study. It contains many sound criticisms upon the leading facts of modern history, and discusses the political opinions of the leading actors in the great measures of the British government during the last three hundred years. Dr. Arnold is a powerful and a candid writer, and delivers his opinions with great independence. But it would be too much to say that he is always free from national prejudices. This perhaps would be too much to expect from poor human nature, and certainly should not be looked for in a professor of history in an English University. We are specially pleased with the enlightened and philosophical view he takes of the traditionary history of the Church of England as found in "the venerable Bede." He shows that this credulous and dreamy ecclesiastic has blundered sadly in his account of natural objects which remain unchanged, and certainly is not to be relied upon with implicit confidence when he records a multitude of miracles wrought upon trifling occasions and apparently without an object. For this and similar offenses the Puseyites will never pardon Dr. Arnold. These real Romish monks in disguise will endure no man who does not place the stupid legends of the dark ages upon

the same foundation with the miracles of Christ and his holy apostles. We are happy that there are those among the divines of the English Church, and even professors in the University of Oxford, who do not swallow these vagaries. This work of Dr. Arnold will be regarded as a valuable contribution to our common literature.

---

13. *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D. D., late Head Master of Rugby School, &c.* First American edition, with nine additional Essays, not included in the English Collection. 8vo., pp. 519. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1845.

This is a work of such importance that our readers may expect, perhaps in our next number, an extended review of it from a competent hand.

---

14. *The Book of Useful Knowledge. A Cyclopedia of six thousand Practical Receipts, and Collateral Information in the Arts, Manufactures, and Trades; including Medicine, Pharmacy, and Domestic Economy. Designed as a Compendious Book of Reference for the Manufacturer, Tradesman, Amateur, and Heads of Families.* By Arnold James Cooley, Practical Chemist. Illustrated with numerous engravings. 8vo., pp. 576. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1846.

The above ample title-page obviates the necessity of a further description of the work which it represents; and so far as we have been able to ascertain from a rather hasty examination, the book is good for all that the description indicates. We are confident that it will be found superior to any book of the class which has heretofore appeared. Particularly to those who have just commenced house-keeping, and to such as have newly set out in a career of business, it will be found an invaluable assistant. The mechanical execution is admirably suited to a work of such a character.

---

15. *The Life of Friedrich Schiller; comprehending an Examination of his Works.* By Thomas Carlyle. From the second London edition. 12mo., pp. 280. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1846.

This is a work of considerable interest, and no little literary merit. The composition is less marked with the peculiarities of the eccentric author than some of his other works. We have here sketched the history and character of a man of genius, who came up from humble life, and, in spite of an unphilosophical and almost murderous system of school discipline to which he was subjected during his minority, early astonished the world with the brilliancy of his powers. *Schiller* was a poet, a historian, and a philosopher of the highest rank. The

analysis employed in the book is philosophical, and the reflections generally judicious; but the moral and religious lessons are not materially above the tone of pure deism.

---

16. *Notes from over Sea: consisting of Observations made in Europe in the Years* 1843 *and* 1844, *addressed to a Brother.* By Rev. John Mitchel. In two volumes, 12mo. New-York: Gates & Stedman. 1845.

We have become accustomed to expect nothing new in a book of travels in Europe. Of course we commenced reading these unpretending volumes without very high expectations, and not knowing whether we should find our way through them. We, however, proceeded with unabated interest to the close, and were amply compensated for our labor. No one writer gives us perfect information of a country. Every intelligent traveler will add something to the general stock of knowledge. Mr. Mitchel is a practical man; and in his observations upon the customs and habits of the people, and the institutions and curiosities of the countries he visited, he brings everything to the test of true religion, sound philosophy, and common sense. We cordially thank him for his "Notes," and hope they will entertain and profit a multitude of readers.

---

17. *Encyclopædia of Domestic Economy:* comprising such subjects as are most immediately connected with Housekeeping; as the construction of domestic edifices, with the modes of warming, ventilating, and lighting them; a description of the various articles of furniture, with the nature of their materials; duties of servants; a general account of the animal and vegetable substances used as food, and the methods of preserving and preparing them by cooking; making bread; the chemical nature and the preparation of all kinds of fermented liquors used as beverage; materials employed in dress and the toilet; business of the laundry; description of the various wheel carriages; preservation of health; domestic medicine, &c., &c. By Thomas Webster, F. G. S., &c., and the late Mrs. Parkes. With Additions and Improvements by an American Physician. With nearly one thousand engravings.

The Harpers have completed this very valuable and universally useful publication, in one large volume, of over one thousand pages. No work has recently issued from the press which embraces so wide a range of topics, or in which every person, in any profession or rank in life, can find so much information of immediate practical utility. It should be in every household, and constitutes of itself a library sufficient for all the ordinary wants of domestic life.

18. *Biographical and Critical Miscellanies.* By WILLIAM H. PRESCOTT. Harper & Brothers.

A NEW volume from the polished pen of Prescott is no ordinary literary boon. The work before us comprises a series of essays and critical papers contributed to the North American Review: they are purely of a literary character. More than an ordinary degree of care seems to have been bestowed upon these miscellanies: they embrace a range of study very different from that by which Mr. Prescott has hitherto been known as an author, so that public curiosity will not be at all abated from this fact, but rather increased, in its desire to accompany this distinguished writer in so new and attractive a department of letters. The publishers have produced this admirable volume uniform in style with their splendid edition of the author's previous works, the "History of the Conquest of Mexico," "History of Ferdinand and Isabella," &c. A beautifully executed portrait, engraved in England, accompanies the work.

---

19. *The American Pulpit.* Original—monthly. Rev. RICHARD S. RUST, A. M., editor. 8vo., Nos. 1–7. Boston.

THE sermons of living ministers possess a peculiar interest. When a sermon is printed it is given to the world, and may be read by multitudes, and by this means we may be instructed by the sermons of those whose voices we shall never hear in the flesh. We wish the enterprise of our friend, the editor of the Pulpit, abundant success. So far —of course excepting our own contribution—he has met the public expectations, and we are gratified to learn that the work is increasing in its patronage. He certainly has some contributors of a very high order of talent to interest and profit his readers.

---

20. *The Missionary Memorial; a Literary and Religious Souvenir.* 12mo., pp. 372. New-York: E. Walker, 114 Fulton-st.

THIS is in all respects a beautiful book. It is got up in the best taste; and the matter is calculated both to interest and profit. A better general theme could not have been selected. The missionary cause is identical with the gospel, in its nature, spirit, and objects. And what could furnish better matter for a religious Annual than the history and practical tendency of missions? The work is partly didactic, partly historical, and partly imaginative and devotional, and divided between prose and poetry. It is, indeed, one of the finest holyday gifts we have yet seen. There is, however, no *Methodist* among the contributors. This *we*, of course, consider a defect.

21. *The Vision: or Hell, Purgatory, and Paradise, of Dante Alighieri. Translated by the* Rev. Henry Francis Cary, A. M. *With the Life of Dante, Chronological View of his Age, additional Notes and Index.* Illustrated with twelve Engravings from Designs by John Flaxman, R. A. From the last corrected London Edition. 12mo., pp. 547. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1845.

What Homer was to the Greeks, Virgil to the Latins, and Milton is to the English, Dante is to the Italians. He flourished the latter part of the 13th and the commencement of the 14th centuries. He took too great liberties with the popes and cardinals ever to be a favorite with them. In his Vision of Hell he found some of these gentlemen suffering indescribable anguish for their abominations while upon earth, in the exercise of their spiritual vocation. No wonder that the popular editions of Dante which are circulated in Italy are expurgated. The character of Dante, as a poet, has been too long and too often celebrated to require eulogy from us. We are glad that his works have been translated into English, and that we are favored with this beautiful American edition. To the lover of the beautiful and the sublime in poetry, it will be most grateful.

---

22. *Poetical Works of James Montgomery; with a Memoir of the Author,* by the Rev. Rufus W. Griswold. In 2 vols., 12mo., pp. 404, 471, Phila.: Sorin & Ball. 1846.

Among living Christian poets, Mr. Montgomery enjoys an enviable distinction. For criticism upon his poetry, had we the ability, we have neither the time nor the disposition. Critics say he excels as a *lyric* poet. The great excellences which characterize his poetic effusions are piety and pure moral sentiment. As a Christian, Mr. Montgomery is eminently *catholic*. His works are an inheritance of our common Christianity, and not of any particular sect. We hail with peculiar pleasure this new and elegant edition of these beautiful and inspiring effusions of a truly great and religious son of the muses. We hope it may be extensively useful, and the enterprising house from which it emanates may find that they have not misjudged in their estimate of the public taste.

---

23. *Christian Exertion; or, the Duty of Private Members of the Church of Christ to Labor for the Souls of Men, explained and enforced.* New-York: Lane & Tippett. 1845.

The doctrines and appeals of this little manual will come home to the heart and conscience of every true lover of Jesus Christ, and the souls for which he shed his precious blood. None such, after reading these pages, will ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?" but all will be led to see, at once, that if the world is ever converted, it must be, to a considerable extent, by the instrumentality of personal Christian effort. Each Christian is necessarily involved in a portion of the responsibility. Every one can do something toward the redemption of the race. Let all prepare for the day when God shall "make inquisition for blood," that then the blood of none of our brethren may be found upon our skirts. Let every member of the church carefully read this work.

NEW SUNDAY-SCHOOL BOOKS,

PUBLISHED BY LANE & TIPPETT, FOR THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

We are glad to witness the rapid increase of new and valuable books in our Sunday-school department of publication.

The superior execution, the choice illustrations, and the high character of these volumes, fit them for a favorable comparison with many works of much greater pretensions.

It is interesting to look back, as we have had occasion to do, and view the rise and progress of this species of literature. From the smallest beginnings, and the most indifferent execution, it has gradually advanced, until we now have the very essence of the largest libraries condensed into a handsome series for sabbath-school children. Former ages gloried in unwieldy tomes, that required the life-time of even the learned for perusal, and that seldom found their way either to the possession or the comprehension of common men. Analysis, simplification, and condensation, are mottos of the present age; and most industriously have they been plied in the preparation of juvenile books for Sunday schools. Our children are no longer abandoned to the tales of Jack the Giant-killer and the exploits of Robinson Crusoe.

Volumes—pure in style, elevated in sentiment, and ennobling in their tendency—are now furnished to them in profusion. History, biography, Scripture antiquities, science, philosophy, morals, and religion have each lent willing and most appropriate tribute to the young, whom they thus solicit to become their votaries.

Nor are the young only interested in reading these books. When well adapted to children and youth, they are found to be peculiarly attractive to adults who have not the time or inclination to peruse more erudite and profound works.

It may indeed be considered a question whether of all the volume reading in the community, at least one-half is not furnished by the various Sunday-school libraries of Christian churches.

The subject, therefore, of preparing Sunday-school books, whether in its application to the young or to the old, is one of vast importance. We have not seen without concern the carelessness which has sometimes been manifest in the selection of books for these libraries. An apology has heretofore appeared to exist in the scanty supply furnished by the official religious press. At the present rate of increase in the

issues, such apology will soon vanish away; and we shall hail that as a day of great and glorious promise when our Sunday-school libraries shall be fully supplied with books of the high character of those we shall now briefly notice.

I.—ADULT DEPARTMENT.

The Sunday-School Teacher's Guide.

Here is a handsome volume in 12mo., printed from large type, and on elegant paper. It has been prepared expressly for Sunday-school teachers. Such a work has long been wanted; and, so far as we can judge, the present has been prepared with discretion.

The reader will find on examination, that instead of a single treatise on Sunday-school instruction, he is here presented with a compendium of appropriate extracts from several of the most valuable works on this subject hitherto published on the other side of the Atlantic. While the plan of the work is somewhat peculiar, it will be found to embrace important advantages.

1. The subject of Sunday-school teaching is regarded in the different aspects in which it presents itself most strongly to different minds.

2. The practical views here presented, although they do not claim originality, possess a characteristic of much greater importance: *they have stood the test of experience.* Having already received the approbation of thousands, their correctness and authority are no longer doubtful.

3. Instead of the purely didactic, a somewhat miscellaneous character is given to the book, which, while it will relieve and interest the reader, will not profit him the less.

Much more might be said respecting the value of the present volume; but we trust this will be apparent to all who peruse it. It remains, therefore, to hope that it may be placed in the hands of thousands upon thousands of the Sunday-school teachers of our churches. It is not designed merely to be put into the teachers' library, to be hastily glanced over by one after another in rotation. It should become the property of each individual teacher, to be preserved, read, and thoroughly *studied*, week after week, and year after year. We venture to predict that those who shall become most familiar with its contents, and who shall most diligently follow its guidance, will prize it most highly.

II.—JUVENILE DEPARTMENT.

We have here a fine assortment of new books for Sunday-school and youth's libraries.

The Egyptian. Price twenty-one cents.

An elegant volume, of the same size and style as "The Jew," published a few months since, containing many interesting things respecting that singular people, the ancient Egyptians, and the country in which they lived; ornamented with characteristic cuts.

The Sunday-School Reciter. Price twenty cents.

At certain seasons of the year frequent inquiries are made for dialogues, addresses, hymns, &c., suitable to be used at Sunday-school anniversaries. No little embarrassment sometimes arises to those who desire to procure, as well as those who are requested to furnish them, at a short notice. Sometimes quite indifferent and unsuitable productions are used on such occasions, for lack of better. The present volume is designed to supply the desideratum, and will prove very useful in view of its special objects. The preface contains some well-timed suggestions respecting the utility of Sunday-school exhibitions, and the proper mode of conducting them.

The Encourager. Pp. 288, with numerous cuts. In paper, twenty-four cents; bound, thirty cents.

This book was issued in monthly numbers during the past year, and is now furnished complete. It has been much sought for already; and we should be glad if every good child in the land could be encouraged by being presented with it. The volume is designed at once to instruct and encourage children in some of their most important duties, e. g., in obeying God, in honoring parents, in enduring trials, in attaining knowledge, &c. These encouragements are interspersed with some of the most delightful MISSIONARY STORIES ever written.

N. B. The volume in a neat paper cover may be sent through the mail for six and a half cents postage.

Amos Armfield; or, the Leather-Covered Bible. 152 pages. Price twenty cents.

Another fine and interesting volume. It gives the conversations of a pious old man with the boys of his neighborhood, whom he used to instruct about almost everything that concerned them, out of a wonderful book that he had.

The Chinese; or, Conversations respecting the Country and People of China. Price seventeen cents.

Here is a primary work of that great and interesting country, denominated by its inhabitants the CELESTIAL EMPIRE. It is illustrated with elegant pictures, and is adapted both in style and arrangement to entertain and instruct the youngest children.

The State and Prospects of China.

This is the title of another and a larger work upon the same country. It is abridged from the writings of Rev. Mr. Medhurst, whose long residence in China, as a missionary, has fully qualified him for writing upon the country. This abridgment is well adapted to general reading. It is systematic, entertaining, and instructive. In no other book of the same size will the reader be able to obtain more correct and useful information respecting China.

The Strange Planet, and other Allegories. 117 pages, with cuts. Price sixteen cents.

A book in which various interesting and important subjects are exhibited in a new and striking light.

Aunt Clara's Conversations with her Nephews. 102 pages. Price sixteen cents.

This is a new book, written by Aunt Clara herself, who has a remarkable talent for telling pleasing stories. All the little boys in the land will wish they had so good an aunt.

Annie Walton; or, Progress from Youth to Old Age. 120 pages. Price sixteen cents.

Annie Walton was a good little girl, who loved her Bible, and who read it much when a child. In this way she became prepared for many afflictions she was called upon to suffer in after life; and especially when at length she became blind, and could no longer read. Children will find this an affecting and profitable book. From it they may learn what to prepare for in coming days.

The Fiery Furnace. 54 pages. Price fourteen cents.

A lively account of the three Hebrews who were cast into the fiery furnace at the command of Nebuchadnezzar.

Religious Anecdotes and Moral Lessons.

This work has been prepared by Rev. G. D. Chenoweth, of the Baltimore Conference. It presents quite a variety both in topics and style. We trust it will answer its intention of benefiting the rising generation, and of aiding parents in training up their children in the right way.

The Temptation; or, the History of Henry Thornton.

Here is a most affecting story of real life, exhibiting the slow but certain progress of intemperance, followed by its bitter fruits. Such a work is needed in every sabbath school.

Napoleon Bonaparte: Sketches from his History. Written for the Young.

No person, young or old, that takes up this book will wish to put it

down before it is finished; and no reader will fail to be profited by its perusal. We doubt whether in the same space there can anywhere be found a better summary of the history of that wonderful man, or a clearer picture of the folly of his extravagant ambition, of the cruelties it led him to perpetrate, and of the downfall in which it terminated. False views of the character of warriors and conquerors have ruined thousands. Need any other fact be stated to show the importance of giving the young especially timely and correct views of those characters? If there is one class to whom more than another this book is particularly commended, it is to that large class of boys, between the ages of five and fifteen years, who often think, and sometimes say, "I would like to be a soldier."

Memoir of Elizabeth Bales: a Pattern for Sunday-School Teachers and Tract Distributors. By Rev. John Angell James.

This, like the preceding book, is a reprint from the press of the Religious Tract Society of London. Its title fully justifies its republication in this country, and its perusal cannot fail to be attended with deep interest, and followed by good and lasting results. The book, as a whole, is an admirable comment on its motto, "Who hath despised the day of small things?"

*** In addition to the above works of the juvenile department, we also have a few in paper covers, 18mo., at thirty-six cents per dozen. *The Dog and the Candle; William Constant; Wants and Wishes;* and *Sunday-School Scholars.*

Also, 18mo., at forty-eight cents per dozen, *Gehazi* and *Railways.*

III.—PRIMARY DEPARTMENT.

The works in this department present a very attractive appearance, and cannot fail to be favorites with children of tender years. They are of the 48mo. size, but scarcely inferior in elegance to any on our table.

Talks with Little Ella, by her Mamma. Two volumes.

We do not hesitate to commend this book as one of the very best of its kind. Respecting its design, we submit what the authoress says in her preface: "I have written this book for little children, three, four, and five years old. I love children, and want to make them good and happy. Most books are not easy for them to read and understand. I thought that I would try to write one that very young children could read without much trouble. If they cannot yet quite read it by themselves, they will still love to have their good sisters and mammas read it to them. I have told you about what has really happened, for I know, dear children, that you love true things best."

After some attention to this work, we feel prepared to urge its introduction into every family in the land. It will scarcely be less useful as a stimulant to the thoughts and piety of little children, than as an example to parents of proper conversation and training of their offspring.

Kindred to the above, and equally excellent, is

The Way to Jesus. Two volumes.

This work is composed of affectionate and familiar letters, addressed to a little girl by her minister. It contains the very things of which teachers and parents often feel the need, viz., examples of youthful piety. Those children who peruse these lovely volumes will hardly fail to perceive that Jesus is "the chief among ten thousand."

☞ We have now reached a point where we must content ourselves with a bare enumeration of titles, having space for nothing more. We may remark, however, *en passant*, that each one of the tiny infantiles whose names we specify (and we learn there are still more in press) has one or more beautiful pictures.

First series, eight pages, six cents per dozen.

TAKE ADVICE.	WAY TO BE HAPPY.	THE FREE GIFT.
ELLEN'S LESSONS.	LITTLE PLOUGHBOY.	THE EAGLE'S NEST.
THE WREN'S NEST.	FEAR NOT.	THE WILL.
OLD SAAMY.	GENEROSITY.	KNIFE-GRINDER.

Second series, twelve pages, ten cents per dozen.

ADVICE TO CHILDREN. HOLD TOGETHER.
THE BROOK AND THE BEAR.

Third series, sixteen pages, twelve cents per dozen.

PERHAPS NOT.	LITTLE GERALD.	THE SPOTLESS LAMB.
ARE YOU READY?	AMELIA FINLEY.	THE SNOW-BALL.
FANNY'S RETURN TO SCHOOL.		HENRY AND HIS GARDEN.
THE RED-HOT POKER.		

Fourth series, thirty-two pages, twenty cents per dozen.

THE APPLE-TREE AND ITS BLOSSOM.		MORNING, NOON, & NIGHT.
THE ACORNS.	THE NETTLE.	SPRING FLOWERS.
MY COUSIN HESTER.	THE BAMBOO.	THE WASP'S NEST.
A NOBLE YOUTH.	LEARN TO OBEY.	THE ORPHAN LUCY.
A STORY ABOUT FISH AND FISHERS.		LILY AND HER DOLL.

Besides the above, which claim to be veritable BOOKS, we also have, or very soon shall have, between forty and fifty varieties of CHILDREN'S TRACTS, each ornamented with a cut, and sold at the rate of two cents per dozen. A part of these constitute a missionary series, and have already become exceedingly popular.

REV. [illegible] EARLY

VIRGINIA CONFERENCE

THE

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1846.

EDITED BY GEORGE PECK, D. D.

ART. I.—*The Works of Isaac Barrow, D. D. To which are prefixed a Life of the Author by* ABRAHAM HILL, *and a Memoir by* JAMES HAMILTON. 3 vols., 8vo. New-York: J. C. Riker.

AN American edition of the complete Works of an old English divine is no faint indication of the progress of theological inquiry among us. That such Works are called for, or even their republication authorized, by the demands of "the trade," affords the clearest evidence of an increasing attention to the better class of the productions of former times. Barrow is confessedly an author of the first grade in his own class. To a mind naturally energetic and fruitful, he brought the aids of much reading, extensive observation, and profound thought. His Works have long been ranked in the first class of religious classics, abounding in clear arguments, forcible diction, and nervousness of style; and it is, therefore, to be presumed, that they will continue to be sought for by the learned and inquisitive of many generations. The publisher has imposed a debt of gratitude upon the public by his enterprise—not to say temerity—in giving them this standard work in a substantial, though plain dress.

Before proceeding to a review of the Works before us, it may not be out of place to digress a little, to notice the principal memoirs of the author, the materials for which are afforded by these volumes. It appears that this subject was almost wholly neglected, both by Dr. Barrow himself, and also by his cotemporaries. The meagre sketch by his executor, Hill, is exceedingly defective, so much so that it is quite unworthy of the name of a biography. The Memoir by Mr. Hamilton is ably written; but, on account of the distance of time, he could add but few facts, and has given us rather a dissertation upon the author's genius and writings than a memoir of his life.

In noticing the history of Dr. Barrow, it is first of all requisite to distinguish him from another Isaac Barrow, (his paternal uncle,) who held various offices in the Church of England in the reign of Charles II. He was successively librarian of Peterhouse, Cambridge; rector of Dowdham; bishop and governor of the Isle of Man; and last of all, bishop of St. Asaph, which office he held till his death, in 1680. None of these places was at any time held by our author.

Dr. Isaac Barrow was son of a London linen-draper, who enjoyed some kind of a monopoly in his trade, by a patent from Charles I. According to the most credible authorities, he was born in October, 1630. At four years old he lost his mother,—"a circumstance," remarks Mr. Hamilton, "which may partly account for that boisterousness of disposition by which his boyish years were signalized, just as the linen-patent of the London merchant may have contributed its own share to the devoted loyalty of both father and son." While at school in the metropolis he made little proficiency in learning, but excelled in juvenile delinquencies; for which cause his father removed him to a school at Felsted in Essex, where a skillful application of the necessary discipline had the desired effect. He quickly became studious and orderly in his habits. When prepared for the university, he experienced a disappointment, in being denied admission to Peterhouse, where his uncle had procured for him a place as pensioner. This disappointment was occasioned by a premature meddling with politics by the young cavalier, by which he incurred the displeasure of the ruling party. His father, by his devotion to his fallen prince, had from opulence become reduced to penury, and was at that time attending the king in his forlorn estate at Oxford; so that little help could be expected from him. His son, however, was at length, by the favor of Dr. Henry Hammond, admitted to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he successfully pursued his studies, and in due time took his degrees. In 1649 he was made fellow of his college, and resolved, after some hesitation, to make theology his study. Reading ecclesiastical history, showed him the dependence of chronology upon astronomy, which induced him to study the latter more thoroughly. His astronomical pursuits made him sensible of his need of a more extensive knowledge of geometry, and so he addressed himself to that science. It required not the gift of prophecy to foresee what would be the effect of such a direction of his mind. The result was such as might have been expected;—the young divine became a devoted mathematician. As an instance of the avidity with which he pursued his favorite

authors, it is related on good authority, that he went through Apollonius between the 14th of April and the 16th of May.

In 1654 he published an edition of Euclid's Elements, which was followed, after an interval of two years, by an edition of the *Data*. The year before he had become a candidate for a Greek professorship in his own college, which was, at the trial had this year, given to his rival; but whether his theological and political opinions contributed to his defeat cannot now be determined. He next resolved to travel, and first passed over to France: he visited his father at Paris, whither he had followed his exiled sovereign, and where both were alike in great poverty. Though his own means were small, yet he generously divided them with his parent, and received from him in return an opportunity to become acquainted with the forlorn court of Charles II., and also some of the chief French nobility,—especially Cardinal Mazarin. From Paris he went to Florence, where he remained nearly two years, studying its antiquities, and thence proceeded to the Levant. He tarried a whole year at Constantinople, and then returned by Venice, Germany, and Holland, and arrived in England in 1659, after an absence of more than four years. His stay at the Moslem capital was occupied with the careful study of the works of Chrysostom,—a circumstance of some interest in his history. He evidently became an admirer of that prince of the Greek fathers; and without at all detracting from his own fame, it may be affirmed that his theological character was modeled after that of his great preceptor.

On his return to Cambridge he took orders,—a course to which he seems to have been impelled by a regard to the statutes of his college, rather than from a sense of duty directly to God. In this, however, as in all important affairs of his life, he doubtless acted conscientiously. The restoration of the monarchy greatly improved the aspect of his affairs, as well as gratified his political feelings. He celebrated the event in a thanksgiving sermon and two Latin poems, in which he prostituted himself as a freeman, a scholar, and a Christian minister, in fulsome adulations offered to a man who disgraced by his vileness whatever was associated with him. The change in public affairs led to the resignation of Widdrington, his formerly successful rival for the Greek professorship, and Barrow was chosen his successor without opposition. This event demonstrated the wisdom of the choice made when the two were rival candidates, and goes far to vindicate the Puritan doctors from the charge of bigotry and unfairness to their opponents. His Greek lecture proved a failure, and he afterward confessed that for the first year he lectured on Sophocles to empty benches. The next

year he brought out Aristotle; and though we are not informed of his success in obtaining auditors, he evidently pleased himself in the selection. As Chrysostom was his master as a theologian, so Aristotle became his guide as a dialectician. The discriminating reader will not fail to trace the impress of the mind of the tutor in the Works of the pupil; and there is cause to believe that Barrow was a better writer for having studied Aristotle.

He remained in the Greek chair at Cambridge but two years, and then exchanged it for that of geometry, in Gresham College, London. The department of mathematics was the only one that really suited his genius, and in this he chiefly delighted. He remained at London but one year, and then returned to Cambridge to assume the duties of a new mathematical chair at that place. In this he remained six years, and then, in 1669, resigned it in favor of his pupil, the subsequently renowned Sir Isaac Newton. During the three following years he held two unimportant places in the church,—one a sinecure and the other a prebend,—both of which he resigned when, in 1672, he was chosen master of Trinity College, Cambridge,—the end of his worldly ambition. This place he held till his death, some five years after, serving his calling with his undivided energies, and in that short period a decided and permanent improvement was made in the affairs of the college.

Besides the works already mentioned, he published, about the time he left his mathematical chair at Cambridge, new and greatly improved editions of Archimedes, Apollonius, and Theodosius, and also a Treatise on Optics. This last was his great work in mathematics, whose highest praise is, that, when it had been published several years, only two persons were known to have given it a careful reading. In the preface he acknowledges his indebtedness to his pupil, "Dom. Isaacus Newton," who "had revised the text, and not only suggested some corrections, but supplied some important additions from his own store." How nearly our author was related to those sublime discoveries which have immortalized the name of his pupil may be conjectured, but not known.

Our present purpose leads us to give special notice to Dr. Barrow's theological writings, to which we shall now confine our remarks. Their literary excellence will be differently estimated according to the tastes and mental capacities of his readers. It was his custom to exhaust whatever subject he took in hands; so that King Charles' small wit led him to call Barrow an unfair preacher, because he left nothing for anybody else to say. In his set treatises this fullness is an excellence; but it is a serious defect in his sermons,

which class of literary productions is subject to stricter rules as to length, than most others. In justice, however, it should be remembered that he never was properly a preacher;—he never had a pulpit of his own, and only preached occasionally and at distant periods for others. His sermons were for the most part written without any special designation as to their being preached, and many of them were never so delivered by him. Nor is their length their only defect, as sermons. The sentences are long, complex, and involved; some of them containing three or four complete propositions, and requiring not less than the same number of minutes for their enunciation; so that in listening to them as spoken, it must have been exceedingly difficult to follow the train of thought. This faulty style was not, however, the effect of feebleness of thought, as is often the case where diffuseness and complexity abound; but rather the reverse. He held his ideas so firmly, and saw them so clearly, that he could dwell upon them at his leisure, turning them in all directions, and viewing them in all their aspects. As he was fertile of thought and clear of perception, his reasoning was conclusive and his language full of energy. But so completely did the sense occupy his attention, that he almost entirely overlooked whatever was only incidental to it, and consequently his language is often inelegant and his style slovenly. Of imagination he was almost wholly destitute. His mathematical exercitations had habituated him to address the understanding exclusively, and therefore he employs but few figures, and these only of the tamest kind. But this defect is but little felt, on account of the vigor and earnestness with which he writes. It is pleasant to contemplate the majestic tread, and the mighty struggles of a giant intellect wrestling with themes worthy of such efforts; and the mind thus occupied, inflamed by the sublimity of manifested power, becomes itself strong to act, and eager for the conflict. It were well if such writings were more in use, instead of the fashionable, slipshod, namby-pamby, which neither affords matter for thought nor fits the mind for action. · These sermons, however, as such, would be intolerable; and if it were his purpose to preach them, it was a proper preparatory exercise to lecture a year to empty benches. Le Clerc justly remarks, "The sermons of this author are rather treatises or concise dissertations, than simple harangues suitable to a mixed audience." He thought and wrote as a gownsman among his associates, rather than as a man of the world among the varied characters of a mixed community. But these faults pertain only in a small degree to his printed sermons, and almost entirely vanish in the expository discourses,

which, with the Treatise against the Pope, are his best productions.

As a divine Dr. Barrow was far removed from the Puritanical divines of his own and earlier times. The period of the Restoration was distinguished not only for violent fluctuations in men's professed opinions and sentiments, but for the contemporaneous existence of the most opposite notions. Puritanical theology had, by strong infusions from the continent and from Scotland, assumed a highly partial character. Not only had the general features of the doctrines of the reformed churches in those parts been adopted, but a slavish adherence to their mere forms of expression was required. With the ruling parties, Calvinism and Christianity were nearly equivalent terms; and because, elsewhere, Calvinism had been associated with ministerial parity, (though that connection was wholly accidental,) so, in England episcopacy must give place to the divine claims of the presbytery. Calvinism and Presbyterianism were the religious tenets of the rebellious commonwealth-men, and that fact alone was sufficient to render these tenets odious to the royalists. The late ruling party was also distinguished for religious zeal, and for a clear manner of stating the principal doctrines of the gospel, especially that of justification by faith: when, therefore, their enemies triumphed, these became badges of reproach, so that to profess salvation by faith alone was nearly allied to disloyalty, and to go to God for pardon without priestly intervention was little short of treason. The effect was such as the premises would lead one to expect. A great decline took place in the tone of religious teaching,—a change affecting not only speculative divinity, but also practical and experimental godliness. In passing from the Puritan divines of the times of the civil wars to those of the established church, at the period of the Restoration, one seems to breathe another atmosphere and to inhabit another climate. In the former, we feel the genial glowing of the vital spirit, and the healthful pulsation of the life-blood of the soul; in the latter, though there may be some degree of both heat and life, they are but a single remove from the coldness of death itself. How marked the difference between such writers, on the one side, as Baxter, Flavel, Bunyan, and Owen,—and Tillotson, Barrow, Burnet, and Sherlock, on the other!

That a sad decline in evangelical piety occurred about this time is now generally admitted; and it was so declared by many of the principal divines of the established church in the next generation. Whoever will be at the trouble to examine the pastoral letters, visitation sermons, and episcopal charges, delivered during the

former half of the last century, will see that the low state of religion in the kingdom was then alarmingly evident. Bishop Butler confessed and deplored it in the Introduction to his famous "Analogy,"—Archbishop Secker reproved it in his sermons,—Bishop Lavington warned his clergy of it in one of his charges, and Bishop Horne complains bitterly of it in his "Apologies." How gloomy must have been the times when the darkness was such as to be felt by those who, themselves, but dimly saw the glories of the light of the gospel! How cheerless the season when such lukewarm spirits shivered in its coldness!

That, however, was not a time when grievous speculative errors entered and became prevalent in the church. The fault was more of defect than of any positive pernicious quality. The tone of divinity was low, rather than its tenets false; a state of things to which few contributed more, in proportion to the amount of his influence, than Dr. Barrow. Tillotson may, perhaps, claim a higher place on that bad eminence, but Leighton and Reynolds were much more evangelical.

The high Calvinism of the Puritans in the reign of Charles I. was opposed by the low Arminianism of Archbishop Laud. But the divinity of that unfortunate prelate was a different thing from that of the celebrated doctor of Leyden, whose name it sometimes bears. A recent Calvinistic writer* acknowledges that "Arminius retained all the essential Christian doctrine, justification by faith; and in some other respects held the doctrines of grace so clearly, that he would by some modern writers have been charged with Calvinism." We avail ourselves of this confession, not to prove Arminius a Calvinist, but to assert on its authority what genuine Arminians have always claimed;—that the doctrines of grace belong quite as properly to Arminianism as to Calvinism. On these particulars the Laudean divinity is as far from the former as the latter. This truth ought to be impressed on the mind of every reader of modern scholastic theology, lest the continual misapplication of terms should occasion a misapprehension of facts.

Dr. Barrow was an Arminian so far as the questions of the famous quinquarticular controversy are concerned. There may, indeed, be some doubt as to his soundness in the doctrine of original sin; but on that point the parties to that controversy were agreed. At that article the Laudean divinity diverges from genuine Arminianism—this being decidedly Augustinian, that verging toward Pelagianism. Any defect at this point is felt through the

* Rev. E. Bickerstith.

whole system, as a difference of views as to the nature of a disease induces a like difference as to the remedy and mode of treatment. To the same degree that he differed in this particular from the notions of Calvinists, he also was at variance with Arminianism; though in most particulars called in question in that controversy, he decidedly favors the Remonstrants. Four of his long discourses are devoted to a defense of universal redemption; and if he has failed to elucidate that subject, it is only because it was already too clear to admit of it. The doctrines of predestination he seldom meets directly, but always implies the Arminian side of the question; as indeed do most Calvinistic writers, when the subject is not formally introduced. With the notion of unconditional perseverance he joins issue on several occasions, maintaining man's constant liability to total and final apostasy. These immutable verities of Christianity were never called in question till the excessive speculations of some reformed churches developed an artificial system of theology; and in later times they have suffered by being entertained in common with other tenets both doubtful and dangerous. Yet the disputes upon these points do not involve any vital doctrine of the gospel, and persons of either party may be both orthodox and evangelical Christians.

It is, however, in evangelical tone rather than doctrinal opinions that our author fails. He seems carefully to shun any open and clear recognition of the peculiar doctrines of the gospel; delighting rather to keep the outworks of the Christian system, than to dwell among the glories of the inner temple. His divinity is not altogether Christless, but in most cases Christ is among the least conspicuous parts of the picture he furnishes; and the cross is placed so far in the background, that it may be readily overlooked. Obedience, rather than simple faith,—duty, rather than experience,—is the theme of his discourses; and the motives insisted upon for even this, are such as the apostles either knew not, or knowing, disregarded. The love of Christ, the only adequate motive to Christian duty, is not much insisted on, nor commonly brought into notice. As an example take the first sermon in this collection, on "the Pleasantness of Religion," in which "wisdom" or religion is treated as much the same with the philosophy of morals, and its pleasures as but little more exalted than those apprehended by the better class of heathen moralists; while the sweetness of penitential sorrow, the joy of pardon, and the hope full of immortality, are not named. The same, with but little modification, may be said of the second, on "the Profitableness of Godliness," and indeed of nearly the whole collection. As moral and casuistical essays

they are good, inculcating sound morality, habitual self-control, and a constant deference to the precepts of the word of God. For instruction in manners these sermons are valuable, and we heartily wish them a wide circulation and a general reading; but they are defective, in not impressing a strong sense of our ruined state through sin, and of God's great love manifested in the death of his Son for our redemption. After reading these productions of a mighty intellect, one is ready to exclaim with her at the sepulchre, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him;" or to apply to this author the saying of Augustine concerning Cicero, "We cease to be captivated with him, because the name of Christ does not appear in him." The *name* of Christ does indeed appear there, but he seems quite unlike him of the New Testament: his is a Christ that rather conceals than displays the tokens of his sufferings, and seems more intent upon his prophetic and regal offices, than upon that in which the sinner has most immediate interest. Justice compels us, however, to make some exceptions to these censures, especially in favor of the sermon on the Passion and that on the Incarnation.

Our author has devoted four of his best-written discourses to a discussion of the great doctrine of faith and justification; in which he gives a very satisfactory view of the theology of the school of which he is a distinguished member. But O! how unlike St. Paul's, or even Luther's doctrine, on the same points! The same terms are used, the same verbal imbodiment of doctrines appears, but the spirit is wanting. There is a want of clearness and singleness of vision, which leads to indistinctness and muddiness of expression. The simple way of salvation by faith seems always to have been the "path which the vulture's eye hath not seen, nor the lions' whelps trodden,"—the way where "the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err." It was of this that our Lord spake, when he gave thanks to the Father that he had hidden these things from the wise and prudent, but had revealed them to babes. Upon this subject the brightest intellects are at fault, and often seem to be blinded by their own brightness; and as this is the only way of life, "he that shall not receive the kingdom of heaven, as a little child, shall not enter therein."

As here presented, justification appears to be a resultant of all Christian graces and attainments, and faith seems to imply all these graces engaged in Christian duties; so that, after all, this is only a legal way of salvation. Justification is, indeed, spoken of as nearly identical with pardon; but that is treated as among the latest of the gifts of saving grace. The offers of divine mercy, as

viewed through this system, present a very different appearance from that which they bear in the unadulterated gospel. There we find a free promise, made on a single condition; it is "look" and "live,"—"believe" and "have everlasting life,"—"trust" and "never be confounded;" here it runs thus,—"to him that doth sincerely believe the gospel, and repenting of his former bad life, doth seriously resolve thereafter to live according to it, he [God] doth (upon the solemn obsignation of that faith, and profession of that resolution in baptism) entirely remit all past offenses, accepting his person, receiving him into favor." It is a small matter to profess the doctrine of justification by faith alone, while such a sense is placed in these expressions as strip them of their proper evangelical meaning. If faith includes every virtue and every grace, the most strenuous legalist may, with all consistency, profess the same doctrine. The question, therefore, resolves itself into an inquiry as to the nature of evangelical faith. If we rightly understand our author, he holds it to be a habit of the soul resulting from a concurrence of the principal virtues. It originates in "sobriety, watchfulness, and teachableness;" it proceeds from "sincerity and judgment," and for its exercise are required "diligence, good desires, patience, prudence;"—"in fine, it supposes a mind imbued with all kinds of virtuous dispositions in some good degree." In the case of Abel it was "piety;" in that of Enoch, "obedience;"—with Noah it consisted in being "a preacher and practicer of righteousness;" and with Abraham, in submission to "the commands and promises of God." What Pharisee would hesitate to confess that he was saved by such a faith *alone?* though probably he would be somewhat at a loss to discover why it is said to be "*alone*." But if the conditions of our acceptance are such, who shall be saved? Can the unpardoned sinner approach the throne of grace, (rather of judgment,) bringing "a mind imbued with all kinds of virtuous disposition in some good degree?" Does not this notion imply that he must become virtuous in order to receive pardon, and therefore that the Pharisee's prayer, in which he set forth his own advanced state of piety, was much more appropriate than that of the publican, who, in calling himself a sinner, confessed his want of "faith?"

But we have usually considered faith among the earliest fruits of the Spirit, second in time only to that godly sorrow which works repentance unto life; and that it is itself the effectual means of all intrinsic grace. Here, however, it appears as the effect of a coincidence of every personal virtue, originating in their union and growing up with their increase. The righteousness of faith, instead

of being freely and immediately given when first we believe, must be gradually attained to by exercising the prevenient graces of "sobriety, diligence, and fortitude." And as the effects of such exercises are necessarily gradual, so must our justification be a gradual work, varying according to the degrees of our "faith," or rather *fidelity*. None can be expected to come suddenly into a state to which so many things conspire, and therefore they are to be accounted enthusiasts who profess to have done so; nor can any one be certainly informed as to his present acceptance, as none can be sure that he is exercising in due degree all the graces necessary to faith; so that it is worse than vain to talk of an assurance of present salvation! It is rather a mercy than otherwise, that such unworthy ideas of Christian privileges are generally accompanied by a corresponding indifference as to these things,—for who, that was fully awake to the state of the soul, could rest in such painful uncertainty respecting its highest possible interests?

This notion of the instrument of our justification changes the view of the nature of the work itself. In our simplicity we had considered it a gift, freely offered through the merits of the death of Christ, contemplating us as sinners rather than otherwise; and that our persons, but not our actions, were accepted of God. This view indeed conflicts equally with the semi-legal system before us, and the ultra Calvinian notion of imputation. The one partly fulfills, and partly makes void, the law through a kind of faith peculiar to itself; the other, by transferring the merits of Christ's active righteousness to our credit, renders him the minister of sin in us. Both contemplate a justification by obedience rendered; and both represent us as accepted as righteous, rather than guilty. To the former the high claims of the divine law present an obstacle, to overcome which we are assured that its rigor is relaxed by the gospel; and that man is admitted to a conditional justification, in virtue of purposes of reformation and future obedience. "God has become reconciled to us by Christ, so as generally to proffer mercy, upon certain reasonable and gentle terms, to all that shall sincerely embrace such overtures of mercy, and heartily resolve to comply with those terms required by him;—namely, *the returning and adhering to him, forsaking all impiety and iniquity, and constantly persisting in faithful obedience to his holy commandments.*" The disposition to return and obey God is admitted to be originally of the Holy Ghost, and as this is never absolutely perfect, the merits of Christ come in as a supplementary value; so that through him our imperfect obedience is accepted and ourselves justified as righteous persons. This is not the simplicity of the gospel, nor

is Christ hereby alone exalted. A second place is assigned to him in the practical work of redemption, man being by intrinsic, though imparted grace, chiefly his own deliverer from condemnation and death. Such a provision is equally inadequate to our wants, and abhorrent to the divine perfections.

The Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy is justly esteemed Barrow's chief work. On this subject he seems to have put forth all his powers of reasoning; and so fully has he shown his competency for the work, that it is allowed by general consent that that business is done, and nothing further is to be desired. The present age is very inadquately prepared to appreciate a work of this kind, notwithstanding our pretended dread of the growing power of Romanism. We have heard of the terrors of Popery at a distance, and have, perhaps, looked upon some degraded victims of its curse with mingled sentiments of pity and disgust; but we have never in reality feared the power of the pope. When we talk of Papal tyranny, our minds revert to England in the days of Mary, or to Spain in the times of the Inquisition; but these are subjects of distant contemplation rather than of immediate interest. Our sympathies may be moved by these things, and perhaps our anger kindled; but we find no sense of personal danger in any of them. Still less do we dread the spiritual tyranny of the great antichrist, whose bolts fall harmless at our feet; we heed not his interdicts and anathemas. This happy immunity may occasion an undervaluing of those bulwarks of the externals of Protestantism, which the necessities of a less-favored age gave rise to, and which have descended to us as valuable legacies, as well as mementos of the fidelity then exercised in behalf of religious truth.

It is related of George III., that when Bishop Watson's famous Apology for the Bible was presented to him, he replied that he was not aware that the Bible needed any apology; so American Protestants may be ready to ask, when they first hear of the celebrated defenses of their faith by Barrow, Usher, and Chillingworth, whether questions are now to be discussed involving the very foundations of their cherished creeds. The late celebrated Robert Hall, in a review of an approved work on the evidences of Christianity, strongly discountenances the introduction of discussions upon that subject into ordinary religious teaching; since attempts to establish the truth of revelation would, in many minds, be the first occasion of calling the subject into question. Similar considerations should teach us to be somewhat cautious in mooting the questions of the "Pope's Supremacy," or the "Safety of the Religion of Protestants." But as the former objection would

not hold good in a case of wide-spread popular infidelity, such as occurred in the latter part of the last century, so the aggressions of Popery in England between the Restoration and the Revolution called for just such a work as Barrow's Treatise. And while we confess that it is inexpedient to be continually raising questions upon fundamental points in religion, it is plainly the duty of the learned to inform themselves on these points. Especially should the ministers of religion be prepared with arguments to repel the attacks of both open and covert enemies; and nowhere else can such preparation be made, as to this particular subject, to better advantage than in this Treatise.

The manner in which he handles the subject displays his masterly powers of argumentation. The assumptions of the Papists consist in a series of propositions mutually dependent upon each other, all of which must be made out to establish their cause. These propositions he reviews in order, and shows each to be not susceptible of proof, or at least not proved. He assumes nothing in advance, and asks our credence only, when to refuse it would do violence to common sense. Few men have enjoyed so many facilities for such a work, and probably no theme could have been chosen so well adapted to the author's genius. His mathematical pursuits had accustomed him to require conclusiveness in all his reasonings, and never to jump at a conclusion; his exercises in dialectics had rendered him skillful in the arts of ratiocination; his acquaintance with ecclesiastical antiquity opened to him the proofs of his positions, while his reverence for the Christian fathers inclined him to make frequent and confiding appeals to their statements, which, addressed to his antagonists, were especially effective.

But we confess that his mode of argument is not that by which we came to the same conclusion, long before we had seen this work. Educated in independence of the arrogant assumptions of Rome, we have found another and we think a better title to our Christian liberty. The title of Protestantism to its claims is not to be sought chiefly among the musty records of antiquity, but is a living spiritual essence, attesting its claims wherever it is found. Our author concedes too much to his opponents, and is himself too nearly connected with the same class of ecclesiastical politicians, to oppose them with most effect. He seems sometimes to be afraid of his own arguments; lest, while demolishing the false pretensions of the Papists, he should endanger his own cherished episcopacy; or lest, while resisting the claims of a pretended universal bishop, he should seem to question the authority of provincial popes. Hence, he is seen sometimes parrying his own thrusts,

or endeavoring to soften the blows that threaten at once to demolish all spiritual tyranny. His conclusions against the claims of the bishop of Rome are irresistible, and his premises are not exhausted in sustaining those propositions. There is a vast fund of unapplied argument which is always available in defense of ecclesiastical liberty, and which has been successfully drawn upon by some who have asserted the indefeasible rights of those whom Christ has made free. This Treatise will, doubtless, be a standard work upon that subject as long as the Man of Sin shall remain to "speak great swelling words." Every Protestant minister should store his mind with these irrefragible evidences of the futility of the pretensions of those who would monopolize the gift of God, and use his grace to minister to their own lusts.

About two hundred pages in the latter part of the third volume are occupied by sundry Latin pieces,—theological themes, academical orations, and poems. Of these but little need be said. The theological pieces should have been translated; as probably nine-tenths of those who will purchase these volumes will make no use of them in their present dress. The orations and poems do quite as well in their present concealment as they would in the vulgar tongue, and had they been left among the forgotten things of Trinity College, the world would not have been greatly the loser. The age is not sufficiently scholastic to authorize the issuing of works in the learned languages for general use, and only from that source can publishers generally expect the demand that can warrant their enterprises.

The last things we notice in the contents of these volumes, are the table of texts of Scripture more or less illustrated in the body of the Works, and an index to the subjects. The former fills twenty-three pages in triple columns, though no text is introduced into the index more than once, though many occur frequently in the Works, and the whole is a monument of the author's learning in the sacred writings. The index to the subjects is copious, (filling thirty pages, in double columns,) and generally faithful, greatly facilitating the labor of making references and consultations. Both these indexes were prepared expressly for this edition,—a circumstance which enhances its value above that of any preceding one.

In conclusion, we must express our thanks to Mr. Riker for this first American edition of Barrow's complete Works. He has brought a highly valuable, and hitherto costly set of Works within the reach of all who may have occasion for them. Though defective, their defects are amply provided against in the prevailing tone of

evangelical orthodoxy found in the better class of modern theological publications; while their sound morality, their irresistible proofs in favor of religious liberty, and their hard common sense, are positive excellences of no ordinary value.

The mechanical execution is such as the work requires. The volumes are not so richly gotten up as to raise the price above the reach of many who might otherwise choose to possess them, nor yet so cheaply as to render them illegible and unworthy to be possessed. The type is good and sufficiently large, the paper fair, and the whole presents a good and substantial appearance. To every student in theology, we say, Read them; and to every reader, Buy them; for a liberal public patronage should reward the generous confidence which alone could induce such an issue.

Art. II.—1. *History of the Revolutions in Europe; from the French of* Christopher William Koch. *With a Continuation to the Year* 1815. By M. Schoell. Middletown, 1836.
2. *History of Modern Europe.* By Wm. Russell, LL. D.
3. *History of the French Revolution.* By M. Thiers.

The last century and a half may be styled the age of revolutions. Improvement is the proper and the natural object of the human intellect. Man continually endeavors to rise in the scale of existence; and each generation attempts the new and untried steps, which the increasing light of the age reveals to its searching gaze. Thus our race, for centuries, has held an onward and an upward course, amid the incessant mutations in the structure of the political world. The amelioration of the condition of the mass is independent of the fate of empires as such, and as they stand forth to our view in ordinary history. Kingdoms and states rise and fall. The towering capitals of one age perish in the next; and curious travelers walk unconsciously upon their buried grandeur, wondering where they stood, and disputing over their different conjectures. But notwithstanding the retrogression of individual states, and the endless transfers of wealth and power from one to another, the general tendency of man has been toward excellence.

We confess that we have but little sympathy with those who are perpetually bewailing the degeneracy of modern times, while they rapturously eulogize the past. We admit that there is evil enough of all descriptions in the world; but when, since the fall, has it been otherwise? When did the cherubim leave their post at the

gate of Eden, or earth cease to be a vale of tears? Truly, if any will persist in declaring that "former times were better than these," the least that we can demand, is, that they should affix a date to this golden age. Let them give the latitude and longitude of their Utopia; and then their theory will possess a "local habitation and a name."

It is a curious fact that this same charge of degeneracy has been made against every succeeding generation, for many centuries. It is as old as poetry or history. Even Homer wearies us with the perpetually recurring phrase, *οἱοι νῦν βροτοι εἰσιν:*

> "A godlike race of heroes once I knew,
> Such as no more these aged eyes shall view."

It was a favorite idea with some, that man has been gradually decreasing physically, as well as mentally, ever since the creation. A French philosopher, using this theory as a quadrant, has discovered that the altitude of our great progenitor, Adam, was about one hundred and twenty feet. But very unfortunately for this hypothesis, the modern traveler finds that the Egyptians, who have slumbered in the catacombs from the days of the Pharaohs, were no taller than the guides who conduct him through the dusty caverns of the dead; or the squalid wretches who worry him for alms amid the ruins of hundred-gated Thebais. We sometimes hear the old lamenting the sad change which the world has undergone, even since they have known it. But the world, when calmly viewed by the deepening twilight of age, seems deplorably fallen from what it appeared to be, when seen amid the rosy dawn of youth. To the youthful eye, hope sheds its delusive beam on all around, and every object is surrounded with a halo of light. But as anticipation is exchanged for experience, the illusion gradually fades away. The traveler over the desert of earthly pleasure sees before him the unreal waters of joy, sleeping, cool and tranquil, in the distance; and on he hurries with cheerful steps to quench his raging thirst. But the shadowy lake recedes as he advances, till at last the mirage is gone, leaving naught but the burning sands of a pathless waste. The evil days come,—the days of darkness, which are many; and he imagines that the world is dayly becoming worse, because he dayly sees more of its evils. He looks back with regret upon the years that are gone; and, perhaps, mistaking the change in himself for a change in the world, commences railing at the degeneracy of the age in good set terms.

But we are inclined to take the ground that the present century is superior to its predecessors, and that the world is improving.

notwithstanding all assertions to the contrary, whether delivered in Homeric hexameters or vulgar prose. Every age has its peculiar virtues and peculiar vices; and we do not imagine that the world is retrograding because new evils appear. All things change, even those apparently least dependent upon outward control. Society itself is an ever-flowing current, whose restless waters are continually wearing away their old embankments and forming new channels; nor can we judge the general direction of the stream by the circlings of the bubbles which are whirled round in some little eddy.

That the tendency of the masses is upward, is shown by the general history of government. Each system of state policy has its fitting time, its allotted duration, and its appropriate successor, —all determined by the moral and intellectual condition of the multitude. The despotic rule, tolerated in the days of darkness and ignorance, yields gradually to the milder forms of government demanded by the increasing intelligence of a more enlightened age. The tyrant who attempts to force despotism upon his subjects, out of its due time, lifts his puny arm against a mighty principle, which, in its resistless march, *must* tear asunder his feeble chains, and crush him into the dust. The oppressor may for a time defer the crisis. But while he is congratulating himself upon the stability of his power, and rioting upon the spoils of an enslaved nation, the sword of retribution hangs over his head in all his revels; and an unseen hand writes upon his palace walls words which proclaim the downfall of his throne, and the liberation of his people. In every nation, the real power resides not with the few, but the many. Foreign intervention apart, no nation can be slaves, save by their own consent; and liberty cannot perish, but by suicide. When the mass, weary of their chains, wake to a sense of their strength, they demand an alleviation of their oppressive burdens, and move onward to the accomplishment of a change in the system of state policy. The several steps of these mutations are sometimes the slowly-formed product of centuries; at others, the intellect of a nation starts from a long lethargy, and performs all as the mighty labor of a day. At one time, the gently-gliding rivulet, atom by atom, wears away the solid rock that obstructs it; at another, the furious torrent rushes forth in its wild career, and sweeps barriers and landmarks into a common ruin.

The records of these upheavings of the masses form the most interesting and instructive pages in the records of the past. All history abounds in the rise and the overthrow of empires, the founding and the fall of great cities, and the victories and defeats of

armies. But though the scenery of the mighty drama is so magnificent and imposing, the real actors are few and far between. Sometimes the history of a nation is but a history of the single intellect that swayed its destinies. A state, like Thebes, rises into importance with some Epaminondas, flourishes while he lives, and, at his death, falls back into its former obscurity. Persepolis is destroyed; but the whim of Thais prompts its destruction. A Grecian army of some tens of thousands spreads ruin and death through nation after nation, from Thrace to India; but the movements of all this multitude are governed by the wild notions of one wrong head. We gather together the records of the battles which they fought, the countries they subdued, and the cities they destroyed; and we style the whole, the History of Alexander. And we say well, for so it is,—a history of the pleasures and the passions, the folly and the madness of one man, in whose hand all the rest became mere puppets. But the history of revolutions is the history of the people. From the moment they rebel against the powers, they cease to be automata. We then learn their real condition, their joys and their sorrows, their hopes and fears. When the dazzling light that encircles the throne of despotism ceases to blind our eyes, we discern the oppression by which it has been sustained. We listen to the cries of the abject millions, whose voices had been drowned in the clamor of wars of conquest, and the rude clash of arms.

Next to our own revolution, those of England and France are of the most absorbing interest to an American. The one was the effort of a nation which had aided us in our struggle against power, and which had, in some degree, been roused by our example to raise the standard of rebellion. The other occurred in the land of our fathers; and from it, indeed, we derived those principles of liberty which have finally ripened into republicanism. The spirit of freedom does not grow up in a night nor wither in a day. The hatred of tyranny which nerved the arms of the pilgrim fathers, also filled the breasts of many who went not into exile: and the very men, who were most instrumental in bringing Charles to the block, were those who, but for the royal mandate, would gladly have found freedom in the wilds of New-England. These great political events both grew out of the operation of the same general principle; but in the minutiæ we discover a wide dissimilarity. It is said by an ingenious writer that these great commotions mutually explain each other; and that "*in the political history of man, both pages must be read together.*" It may not be an unprofitable employment to institute a comparison between them, that we may

search out some of the lessons of political wisdom which they are calculated to teach. The kind and the degree of the oppression which convulsed the two nations differed widely; and the revolutions, arising from causes so dissimilar, are indicative of the progress of the national mind at their several periods. The fact that the despotism of Charles and James was as intolerable to the English, as that of Louis was to the French, is a truth which should not be lightly passed over by him who would inquire into the science of government.

England, for a long period anterior to the expulsion of James, had been kept in continual ferment by the contests between the king and the representatives of the people. At the Restoration, in 1660, Charles II. was received with the utmost loyalty, and the devotion of his people knew no bounds. The tears of joy, and the enthusiastic acclamations of the multitudes who welcomed his entry into London, were but the index of the sentiments of a vast majority of the nation. The people hated tyranny, but they loved royalty; for royalty was an institution of olden time; and the English will tolerate many abuses, provided they are good old abuses, covered with the rust and mold of reverend antiquity. They imagined that the fate of Charles I. would not be a lesson lost upon his successor; but that it would teach him, that moderation in the exercise of power was the only mode of rendering that power permanent. His private character and his public acts, however, soon conspired to alienate the attachment of his people. His dissolute morals offended the stern and rigid Puritans, who were a numerous and respectable body; his attempts to enlarge the royal prerogative roused the opposition of the patriot; while the covert predilection for Popery charged upon him, gave rise to a distrustful jealousy which never relaxed its vigilance. And although for three years immediately preceding his death he governed without a parliament, yet his sway was in momentary danger of being overthrown in a general rebellion. It is almost certain that his death alone saved him from forcible dethronement by his exasperated subjects. A part of his people were in that restless, feverish state which shows a ripeness for revolt. His assumption of absolute power was submitted to with stern calmness by those who, at the moment of submission, neither forgot nor relinquished their rights, but merely deferred the day of retribution. The nation was comparatively at rest; but it was only the couching of the lion, silently watching an opportunity to spring upon his foe, and tear him to the earth.

James II., on his accession to the throne, inherited the hatred

of the people, as well as the crown of the sovereign. Affairs immediately assumed a new phase. Charles had been a man of no religion at all. He seemed, at times, much disposed to favor the Romish system; but he was never long consistent with himself. Even when upon his death-bed, his conduct was a tissue of absurdities and contradictions. He seems to have left it undecided, till the last moment, whether to be a Protestant or a Papist. To extricate himself from this dilemma, he decided to conform to the ceremonies of both. He received extreme unction and the sacrament at the hands of Huddlestone, a Popish priest; and then sent for six bishops of the Establishment, received the sacrament again from their hands, expressed his regard for the Church of England, and died. But James was just the reverse of his easy, careless brother. He was a bigoted Papist; and while duke of York, had already incurred the enmity of the great mass of the nation, by his avowed attachment to Popery. All that was unfavorable to Protestantism, in the reign of Charles, had been attributed, doubtless with great justice, to the influence which James possessed over him. Although the public apprehensions were for the moment lulled by James's declaration in favor of the Establishment, yet his subsequent course soon revived them in tenfold vigor. Suspicion quickly ripened into certainty. He took a course directly counter to the desires and the prejudices of his subjects, and, in defiance of the most strenuous popular opposition, attempted to supersede the Protestant faith, by the introduction of the absurdities of Rome. He attended mass with all the ensigns of royalty; and although to hold any intercourse with the pope had been constituted treason, by act of parliament, he sent the earl of Castlemaine to Rome, to reconcile himself to the head of the church. He also grasped at far more civil power than the laws bestowed, or the people were willing to concede; and in all things he showed his firm faith in the divine right of kings. He levied taxes and collected customs, without waiting for the legal mode of an act of parliament; and intimated to that body, that deference to his wishes alone would enable them to be upon amicable terms with the throne. Still, the great cause of the revolution was the nation's dread of Popery, and the royal love for it. The established religion had been changed several times within a century, and every change had produced penal codes and persecutions. It must be confessed by all candid men, that the principles of liberality and Christian toleration were neither understood nor practiced by Churchmen, or Romanists. The dominant church, whatever its doctrines might be, whether they emanated from Rome, Germany, or Geneva, was

a persecuting church. Even the leading minds, which had received the reformed doctrines, were more or less tainted with this leaven of Rome. But if Protestantism was not free from the persecuting spirit, we can easily imagine what Popery must have been. The fires of Smithfield were yet held in remembrance among the people. The king was now suddenly smitten, professedly, at least, with the charms of free toleration, and at once by his own authority annulled, in effect, the laws designed to prevent the Catholics from regaining the power which they had so fearfully abused in the reign of Queen Mary. But the people knew James too well to believe that his toleration proceeded from an enlarged liberality of mind which would honor the religious sentiments of all his subjects. They saw, in this movement of the king, the first of a series which would finally summon the Gardiners and Bonners of their own times, with their equipment of racks and gibbets, to lay waste the church and shed innocent blood.

Whatever may be our opinion of the correctness of the emotions with which the English regarded these attempts to restore the power of Rome, we must admit that circumstances were calculated to excite, rather than allay, their fears. At the very time that James was pleading liberality of sentiment as a pretence for fostering Catholic influence, his brethren in the faith were, in France, furiously persecuting those who had renounced the dogmas of Popery. The Romish Church claims to be one and indivisible; all its branches throughout the world are, if true to their vows, under the perfect control, in matters in any way pertaining to religion, of the head of the church, occupying the seat of St. Peter: and therefore it was not illogical or unreasonable for the British Protestants to identify Popery in England with Popery in the dominions of the Grand Monarch. But the transactions then transpiring among the subjects of Louis XIV. were not much calculated to recommend the religion of the French king to any who regarded the welfare of either soul or body. The Huguenots, after being savagely persecuted for many years, had found peace, in 1598, by the promulgation of the edict of Nantes. This edict continued in force till the year 1685; and the churches of the reformed faith had rest and abundant prosperity. But in that year it was revoked, and another savage persecution commenced. The churches of the Protestants were destroyed; blood flowed in torrents; and the brutal soldiery committed the most horrid excesses. Half a million of the best citizens of France fled into exile. The most of these passed over into England, where they spread throughout the land the history of the sufferings which they had endured, and the

horrors which they had witnessed. The English Protestants looked upon these things as the legitimate effects of the predominancy of the Popish faction; and drew the conclusion that they must prepare to undergo the same horrors, if the king should succeed in his measures. Their king had already shown himself abundantly endowed with the intolerant spirit. When James was placed at the head of the government of Scotland, Charles was anxious to establish episcopacy in that kingdom. James, being a bigoted Papist, was, of course, equally a hater of the Establishment, and of the Covenanters, who refused to conform to its rites and ceremonies. He therefore became an amateur inquisitor; a critic in the art of torture; and labored as earnestly in the vocation, as if he realized that he was only rehearsing for more extensive performances upon another stage of action. These things were not lost upon the Protestants. They looked upon them as the black shadow which coming events cast before; and when, in the midst of all their fears, James showed his full determination to introduce Popery, their exasperation rose to the highest pitch. But the sovereign, when the whole realm was upon the verge of rebellion, seemed under the influence of some strange hallucination, which rendered him blind to his danger. He went madly on till the very moment of the explosion. When he saw his error, it was too late to amend it. He was willing to make peace with his people upon almost any terms; but they scorned his concessions, and doubted his promises. They cast off their Popish sovereign. William, the prince of Orange, who had been for some years watching for this opportunity, was invited to England by some of the most influential of the patriot party. He came; and the cause of James was utterly ruined. The people deserted him; his army went over to the camp of the prince, and even his favorite daughter, Anne of Denmark, joined his enemies. At last, despairing of ever being able, unaided, to retrieve his fallen fortunes, he left his throne to his rival, and fled for protection to the court of his Catholic Majesty of France.

Thus ended the English Revolution proper. With the invitation to accept the crown, which was tendered to the prince, there was joined the famous Declaration of Rights, which communicated the conditions upon which the crown had been tendered, and defined the powers of the sovereign; thus securing the liberties of the subject from all encroachment. The passage of the Toleration Act was secured, the courts of justice were purified, the prerogatives of the crown were curtailed, and the power of the House of Commons, or, in other words, the political influence of the peo

ple, was proportionably augmented. Such was the British Revolution; and it certainly merits our approbation, even when we try it by the severe test of the increased political intelligence of the present age. It illustrates the power of public opinion, which, from that hour, has exerted an influence which it never before possessed. The revolution was completely successful, because the age demanded it, and the nation was prepared for the improvements it introduced.

Let us now turn to the French Revolution. This extraordinary popular commotion combines the most incongruous traits of character,—the noble and the exalted, with the absurd and the inhuman. It deserves neither the unqualified censure, nor the boundless commendation, which has been so liberally bestowed upon it by writers of opposite prejudices. The state of the French nation, previous to the revolution, was vastly dissimilar to that of the English at the same period in their political history. The British government had, at least in some degree, kept pace with the age. The feudal system had been gradually worn away; the church had been deprived of many of its unreasonable rights and immunities; and the prerogative of the king, when compared with that of the French sovereign, had been much curtailed. In France, on the contrary, the intolerable feudal system, with all its grinding oppression, existed in its original perfection, till within a very few years of the execution of Louis. The nation was divided into two great classes, the oppressors and the oppressed. The privileged orders, which comprised the noblesse and the clergy, constituting about four hundredths of the whole population, monopolized all the offices both in church and state; while the peasant, however great his talents, or his honest ambition, was doomed to be a peasant still. This, however, was one of the trifling items among his many grievances. Those who possessed the power, employed it in tyrannizing over the rest of the nation, who were comparatively slaves. They were, in fact, reduced to abject servitude. The privileged few possessed immense wealth; their estates comprised about two-thirds of the landed property in the kingdom. These estates were cultivated by a miserable, ragged, ill-fed peasantry, who toiled, under the most oppressive regulations, for the wealth which their lordly masters squandered amid the revelry and dissipation of a licentious capital.

Those of the middle classes, who cultivated their own estates, were in a condition but little preferable. Though they possessed a third of the lands, and composed a very important part of the nation, they wielded little or no political influence. When the

general parliament of France, *les Etats Généraux*, was in existence, their weight was felt in affairs of state; but that body had not been convened for more than a century and a half. These small proprietors, of the *Tiers Etat*, were compelled to pay the old feudal dues to their lords, tithes to the priests, and imposts to the king. The taxes on the nobles were but trifling,—being those upon personal property alone; the clergy had the very convenient privilege of determining the amount of their own taxes: consequently, the chief burden of the state fell upon those who were least able to sustain it. But these grievances, great as they were, constituted but a part of the oppression under which the mass were groaning. Numerous edicts were in force, prohibiting, under severe penalties, the most necessary operations of the husbandman, lest the game should be impaired in its flavor, or be prevented from propagation, and thus the luxuries and the sports of the few be curtailed. The farmer was forbidden to protect his crops from the depredations of the deer and other game, herds of which ranged through large districts, where there were no inclosures to prevent their ravages. The party that claimed to be injured by the infringement of these laws had entire control over the courts where the offenders were arraigned; and thus opportunity was afforded for the most iniquitous oppression. The administration of these laws, such as they were, had become corrupt; and neither the person of the peasant, nor the honor of his family, was safe from the passions of an imperious and unprincipled nobility. In all things the higher classes acted upon the comfortable assumption, that the many had been created expressly for the accommodation of the few.

This state of things had been borne for a length of time; but circumstances were every day diminishing the disposition to endure it longer. The secret of their own strength, and the weakness of their enslavers, slowly dawned upon the people. The elements of a revolution were gradually forming, and a variety of causes concurred to precipitate the crisis. The literature of the day dealt largely in philosophic speculations concerning the natural rights of man; and this literature reached many minds which were already chafing under their chains. A daring spirit of inquiry was called into action, which boldly called in question every opinion and principle of government or religion, however time-honored; and thus, for a long time, the whole structure of church and state was silently undermined. The finances were also in the utmost disorder. For many years there had been an annual deficit in the revenue, and some change was absolutely necessary in order to

restore the national credit. The comptroller-general, M. de Calonne, proposed to an assembly of the Notables, that the taxes should be equalized upon all classes. If this statesman's plan had been acceded to, in all probability Robespierre would not have been the tyrant of Paris, nor Louis Philippe a pedagogue among the young democracy of America. But his truly just and patriotic proposition raised such a storm of invective against him, that he was glad to resign his office and retire to a foreign land, and thus escape the vengeance of the nobles and the Popish clergy. This madness of the privileged orders increased the popular exasperation. A failure of the produce of the earth, causing a scarcity of provisions, rendered the multitudes more excitable by adding to the misery of their condition. And the American Revolution, with its happy results, which were rapturously described by the French soldiers who had fought in our behalf, had created, everywhere among the commons, an enthusiastic desire to share the advantages of the same institutions.

All these things, and more, conspired to overthrow the existing system of government. For years the mine had been silently excavating beneath the edifice; but now the charge was fired, and the whole structure sunk into a mass of shattered fragments, while a world trembled with the explosion.

The ancient form of government was totally destroyed; and society, resolving itself into its original elements, commenced *de novo*. A liberal constitution was formed; and the nation deluded themselves into the full belief that France was a veritable republic, constructed upon the most approved philosophical model, and destined to stand till time should be no more. But the people were not prepared, morally and intellectually, for so sudden a transition. When the eyes of the blind are couched, the moment of the operation is not the fitting time to place him upon a precipice, where the utmost keenness of vision alone can insure his safety. We are not to estimate the fitness of a people for republicanism, by the eloquence of the orators who declaim upon the subject, or by the violence with which the rabble clamor for democracy. A free government is not shouted into existence amidst the waving of hats and the acclamations of a mob; nor does it necessarily rise from the ashes where the fires of popular violence have spent their fury. A republic can have being, only where there is a sober conviction in the national mind, that the supremacy of good laws is essential to the well-being of the body politic. But the French populace had so long known the law as the instrument of despotism, that they were, in some degree, excusable for not having very

clear conceptions of the utility of public subordination. They were not capable of appreciating rational freedom; but, to their minds, nothing was liberty but exemption from all law:—just as among the more stupid of our southern slaves, freedom means exemption from labor. After nine years of bloody anarchy, the nation relinquished its high hopes and insane speculations, and submitted to the energetic sway of Buonaparte. Thus the first revolution was brought to a close, though for many years the people writhed under the endless train of evils which it induced. To use a simile of one of their own orators,—"The raging billows dashed upon the shore, long after the storm which created them had passed away."

The French Revolution, compared with the English, was a decided failure. They did not found the free government which they desired. They were incapable of it. They did not accomplish that at which they aimed, because they attempted too much for the state of the people. France was not ready for republicanism; and a limited monarchy was the highest point of perfection in their circumstances attainable. Liberty is not a Minerva, who, in the full vigor of maturity, leaps into existence from the brain of some half-crazed visionary. She partakes so much of the nature of earth, that she must pass through the successive stages of childhood and youth, before she arrives at her full stature. Hence, the grand mistake of the French leaders. They speculated on the *original* perfectibility of human nature, till they forgot the important fact that it was not *actual*. Their dreams assumed the form of palpable reality; and, as mere theories, were tolerably perfect: but when they grasped at the shadow, it vanished. If no usurper had seized the supreme power, if the dread of free institutions had not prompted foreign interference, there is a possibility, that, in the course of time, the popular ferment might have subsided, and a degree of order have been established. The sands of Arabia are not fitted to nourish the cedars of Libanus; but, by cultivation, even the desert may be made to "blossom as the rose."

But with all its horrors and its but partial success, the revolution was beneficial. The remedy, terrible as it was, did not surpass the evils of the disease. The lower orders were raised from their degradation. The nobles were cast down from their unjust and irrational exaltation. The church was, in the end, established upon a far better system than the former had been. The state of France, after the revolution, and when Napoleon was upon the throne, was much inferior to that of England in the reign of William and Mary; but still it was vastly improved. Indeed, if the

French could have exchanged the intolerable yoke of the privileged orders for the milder tyranny of Charles and James, they would have hailed the event with exceeding joy, as constituting, in itself, a glorious revolution.

In comparing these two great struggles of the mass, we notice, besides the different degrees of actual oppression, a wide dissimilarity in the nature of the grievances that stung them into active resistance to power. If the religious scruples of the English had not been trampled upon, there is a probability that James would not have been driven from his throne. They were comparatively patient under the requisitions of the sovereign, until his movements assumed the form of an attack upon their religion. The Popish superstition was both feared and hated by the descendants of those who had, in three years' space, seen the flames curling around the writhing forms of two hundred and seventy-seven men, women, and children, whose crime was the heinous one of believing, that, after the priest had gone through the mummery of pronouncing, *Hoc est corpus*, over a piece of bread, it was bread still. They would not suffer the same corrupt system to be again forced upon them by a bigoted king, and the plotting myrmidons of Rome. They were not so curious concerning the mysterious doctrine of the real-presence, that they desired to see any more light cast upon it by the flames of Smithfield. The French, on the contrary, were driven into insurrection by civil oppression. The feudal dues, the enormous taxes, the quartering of soldiery upon them without their consent, the laws depriving them of all weight in state affairs,—these were the incitements to revolution. The commons demanded an equal distribution of the imposts upon all classes; they asked for legal protection against the violence of a haughty, unprincipled aristocracy, and a restoration of that portion of political power to which, as citizens, they were entitled. The lower orders of the people demanded a repeal of those laws, which virtually doomed them ever to remain at the lowest point in the scale of humanity. These things drove them into rebellion; and religion is seldom alluded to, save with an infidel sarcasm, or an impious jeer, at the very existence of a God.

The leaders of the French were men of entirely different character from those who were at the head of the English revolutionary movement. It must be confessed that some of the English politicians were by no means immaculate. It must be conceded, too, that the English prelates were not conversant with the doctrines of the "Appeal to the American Churches;" and that, moreover, they were somewhat deficient in that enlarged liberality

which it inculcates. But, however much we may deplore this deficiency, we must remember that it was universally prevalent. The dark clouds, with which Popery had enveloped the souls of men, were not entirely dispelled. After all that had been accomplished, it was still but the morning of the Reformation; and the truth yet shone with a lurid light. But with all their defects, how great is the contrast between the patriots who resisted the encroachments of James, and the Robespierres, the Dantons, and the Marats, of the reign of terror! How bright shines the fame of the bishops who opposed the royal schemes for the subversion of Protestantism, and were committed to the Tower, in consequence of their non-compliance,—when compared with Gobet, bishop of Paris, and his fellow-apostates, who solemnly renounced all religion as an arrant imposture, the cunning device of priestcraft, and offered their churches for the contemptible foolery of worshiping the goddess of reason, in which character a dancing girl from the opera now figured!

The influence of these men was in perfect accordance with their natures; and they imparted their own character to the movements which they guided and controlled. The patriots of England were resolute in defending their rights; but they were averse to anarchy, and were disposed to employ only that degree of force which would secure the freedom which they sought, without destroying all government. The French agitators belonged to another school. Though the multitudes were, doubtless, actuated at first by the love of liberty, yet soon the rage for vengeance apparently swallowed up every feeling; and the instigators of these commotions were destitute of that calm wisdom, and high moral principle, which would have prompted them to withstand the unholy passions of an excited populace, and so guide the popular tumult as to secure the greatest amount of good, at the expense of the least possible evil. They incited the frenzied rabble to the greatest enormities. That infernal triumvirate, Marat, Robespierre, and Danton, taught the people to delight in spectacles which would have melted the hearts of common villains. And the fate of these wretches is an instructive lesson to those reckless demagogues, who would, by their own example, teach the multitudes that moral principle and common justice are but whims, mere shadows, which vanish into their original nothingness at a nod from the many heads of the omnipotent mob. They were almost all sacrificed by the engine of death, which they had themselves hurried into such fearful activity. In fact, the passions of the people soon became too fierce to be controlled; and those who had inflamed them, became the

victims of a blind fury which they had roused for the destruction of others. Like unskillful machinists, when they had set the mighty engine in motion, they were totally unable to control it; and, one by one, they were drawn in and crushed among the ponderous wheels. There may be such wretches in every age and nation; but they never thus expose their diabolical passions to public view, unless there be a lamentable destitution of public virtue. They are meteors, which never draw their bloody train across the sky, till the thick gloom of night gathers round.

A most striking disparity between the two revolutions is seen in the destruction of life. This is owing, in some measure, to the comparative unanimity of the English. There was, indeed, a small party who would have rejoiced at the introduction of Popery; but there were no castes arrayed against each other, whose mutual hatred had, by tradition and actual sufferance, been accumulating for centuries. Consequently, the English were without some of those incentives to violence, which fired the minds of their excitable neighbors. They had resolved to be free from oppression; and when they had accomplished this object, they had no insane desire of vengeance upon those whom they had already deprived of all power to injure. There were popular tumults, but history records no butchery. The infamous Judge Jefferies, indeed, narrowly escaped being torn in pieces by the people; but it is marvelous that he escaped at all, and that he had not long before fallen a victim to just popular indignation. The people manifested much forbearance throughout this most exciting period. The short war between James and William was no part of the internal movement; and the slaughter at Glencoe was an instance of royal barbarity which called forth the indignant censures of the nation.

But how great is the contrast when we turn to the French Revolution! The cruelty of the days of terror is absolutely indescribable. The revolutionary factions, in whatever else they might dissent from each other, agreed in this, that the way of escape from the house of bondage lay through a sea of blood. "Grind plenty of the red," shouted the facetious painter, David; and his voice was answered by the lion-like growl of the savage Danton; while Marat coolly sat down to calculate, with mathematical exactness, the price of a republic in human heads. And all was done in the name of liberty and equality. The hypocritical Robespierre himself, as he whined out *Pauvre peuple* over a blood-thirsty mob, and then told them where to murder next, was for ever canting of "eternal justice!" The arch-assassins in these sanguinary scenes gave their miserable victims the sublime assurance, so full of con-

solation, that it was the nation that demanded their heads; and that the nation was "always great and always just." If every other emotion were not swallowed up in strong indignation, it would provoke a smile to see the idiotic self-complacency of these demons. While their clothes were yet dripping with the warm blood of helpless innocence, they would throw themselves into oratorical attitude, and harangue, in philosophic fustian, concerning liberty, and equality, and virtue, and the natural rights of the human race, with as much complacency as though they were fully persuaded that these lofty terms had been coined expressly for that bloody era. They were, apparently, the dream of Manes realized,—men endowed with a dual soul, a good and an evil one; but while the angel theorized, the devil acted.

We have now drawn a comparison between some of the leading characteristics of the two revolutions. Circumstances, when not absolutely necessary to point out the direction in which the popular current was setting, have not been detailed. The history of mind is of more importance than that of mere physical action. The reformation of political thought and feeling is of far greater moment than the overthrow of the existing polity; and to abolish an unjust law is a nobler achievement than to behead a tyrant.

Every reader must be struck with the fact, that the progress of the French toward the desired goal of civil liberty was stained with outrages that were new, even in the history of popular commotions. And it may not be an uninteresting examination, to investigate briefly the causes which, probably, gave the revolution its sanguinary character. A multitude of minor causes might be assigned. But, waiving the discussion of these, we conceive that the grand sources of the bloodshed which filled France with lamentation and wo may be defined thus:—barbarism superinduced by oppression; an extreme thirst to be revenged for the intolerable tyranny of the privileged orders; and general immorality consequent upon widespread atheism.

These are amply sufficient to account rationally for the exceeding violence of the French, without our being compelled to attribute constitutional cruelty to that nation. It is illogical to assign more than sufficient causes for any given effect. Let us glance at each of these several particulars.

It is a fundamental truth, an axiom in humanity, that it is the necessary result of long-continued servitude, of extreme oppression, to degrade its victims, mentally and morally, below the level to which they might otherwise attain. We doubt whether there has ever been an exception to this law, from the exodus of the Israel-

ites from Egyptian bondage, to the date of emancipation in Antigua and Barbadoes. France had sunk to the lowest point of civil degradation. The many were the virtual slaves of the few. The nobles and the Popish priests lorded it over the mass with almost absolute sway. But man is so constituted, that if he be deprived of all motives to intellectual exertion, and of all self-respect, he gradually sinks; and in a series of generations he seems to lose almost all his faculties and passions, except those which he possesses in common with the brutes that perish. This truth was partially exemplified among the lower orders of the French. The peasant had been taught, that both he and his donkey had been created for the sole purpose of promoting the convenience of their noble master. The incessant iteration of this lesson, enforced with the strong logic of the sword, whenever the smallest inclination to call it in question had been manifested, caused him to feel that his case admitted of no alleviation. And when the revolution suddenly burst upon his astonished eyes, he was frantic in the exercise of that power which experience had never taught him to use with moderation. The French are nowise deficient in intellectual power; and yet, in civilization, they were centuries behind the English. A single fact will demonstrate this: the absurd custom of questioning by torture, a relic of barbarism, was not abrogated till within a very few years of the execution of Louis XVI. The barbarism of the lower orders had reacted upon the higher classes, and was diffused through the whole nation. Even the French women reveled in the indiscriminate butcheries of the reign of terror, with as much fiendish satisfaction, as those of what we sometimes call the sterner sex. They formed a club for the discussion of public measures. They sat at their needle-work, around the guillotine, upon the benches which the proverbial politeness of their nation had placed for their accommodation; and shrill female voices mingled in the hoarse clamors of the mob for more executions.* And when we hear of the cruelties inflicted upon individuals of the sex, we must remember that these are palliated, if indeed palliation be possible, by the fact that the females themselves threw aside the feminine graces which are the natural safeguard of the sex, and taught the populace, that these also were

* If any man seem to be contentious, and insist that the French women's honoring the guillotine with their presence is not to be deemed a proof of barbarism, inasmuch as multitudes of our own ladies, in these days of refinement, find exquisite delight in attending public executions, we shall be compelled to leave him to the full enjoyment of his own opinion.

among the absurdities which the superior intelligence of the age had rendered obsolete.

How wide the difference in the passions manifested in the two revolutions! And yet we cannot say that this disparity is owing to anything, save the disparity of circumstances. The Briton, seeing the degradation, political, moral, and religious, of his Gallic neighbor, should not rashly bid him stand by, as being by nature less holy; but should first inquire whether the excesses of the French were not caused by a long train of circumstances, which reaches back through many generations. We do not wish to apologize for outrage, whatever may be the posture of affairs when it is committed; but no one can question the justice of that principle of ethics which declares that the turpitude of the crime is commensurate with the degree of light enjoyed at the time of its commission.

The second cause alluded to, is the fact that the wrongs of the French were much deeper; and consequently the passions of the people were inflamed to a greater degree. This is independent of the former principle mentioned. When a nation, especially one of native energy of character, is oppressed, there is a constant tendency to reaction. There is a law of equilibrium in politics, as well as in physics; and the waves of the ocean, which are lashed into being by the mighty winds, do not hasten toward their former level with more certainty than overgrown despotism tends to its downfall. That men should regard their own personal welfare, is as certainly a law of nature, as that snow, formed in the air, should descend to the earth. The attempt to arrest its operation, merely results in accumulating hatred and violence for the day of retribution. And unless there be a lamentable deficiency of mental power and nerve of character, in the oppressed, the gathering storm will not long hide its wrath. As it sometimes occurs in Alpine regions, the valley below may be all sunshine and gladness; but in some dark mountain gorge the avalanche is slowly and silently piling up its resistless weight, till at some unforeseen moment, while the vale echoes the songs of careless joy, its slumbers are over, and it suddenly sweeps down from the bosom of the clouds with its crushing strength, and buries all in helpless ruin.

France had drunk the cup of degradation to the dregs. And when those who were writhing under their intolerable burden, began clearly to comprehend their rights, it is not surprising that they were roused to fury. To escape from their grievous bondage had always been desirable; but they now saw its obvious possibility. A French army, returning from the capture of Lord Corn-

wallis at Yorktown, spread abroad the principles of the revolution whose battles they had fought. The scales fell from the eyes of the multitudes: they saw the utter weakness of their oppressors, and resolved to endure no more. This new creed taught the peasant that all men are by nature free and equal; and this declaration found a response in his inmost soul. He looked around him, and saw his abject condition. He was existing solely for the benefit of another, of like passions with himself. He had toiled; but the product of his labor and sweat had been wrung from him to support, in luxurious splendor, an aristocracy without honor, and a priesthood without religion; while his own children hid their rags in a hovel, and lacked for bread. And with a bitter malediction on his own supineness, he arose and began the work of vengeance. "The devil of tyranny," says a writer, "always rends the body he leaves." Truly, in this case, his name was Legion. The English enjoyed comparative freedom. Violence, in their circumstances, would have been without the palliatives of the French. The outrages of the latter could have been predicted by any one acquainted with the state of the nation. Though not justifiable, they were certainly natural.

The sentiments with regard to religion, which were prevalent among the French, also had a powerful influence in determining the more violent character of the revolution. The English, as a nation, were strongly imbued with reverence for the Deity. They honored the institutions of religion; and their regard for its laws did not desert them during the convulsions that shook the state. Religious freedom, indeed, was the principal object for which they contended. They saw their faith assaulted by the king and his Popish satellites. To learn what the probable result of his success would be, they had only to cast their eyes across the channel, where they saw the Grand Monarque piously dragooning his subjects to heaven; and with fire and sword, torture and death, luring the wanderers back to the arms of Him whose yoke is easy, and whose burden is light. The more fiercely their religion was assailed, the more fervently they loved it. And they reaped the reward of their strong religious feeling, in its restraining and tranquilizing influence upon the excited minds of men. That which was a cloud by day, became a pillar of fire to guide them through the thick darkness of their political night.

The French, on the contrary, were as averse to religion as the English were favorable to it. The ruling faction worshiped reason, in a style worthy of madness or idiocy; and the nation was verging upon atheism. And, indeed, when we examine the condi-

tion of the national church, the skepticism of the new school of philosophers causes more sorrow than astonishment. The ecclesiastical establishment was a mass of utter corruption. One cannot but be struck with this fact, even in studying the statements of Abbe Barruel; although he writes, at the same time, with the caution of Jesuitical *esprit du corps*, and Gallic high-pressure enthusiasm. If the Romish doctrine be the truth, never did the truth have a fairer field; and never has it been proclaimed with less success. Popery had always been in the ascendent, and it was yet in the plenitude of power. It lays claim to the entire rock upon which the church is founded, and monopolizes the promise, that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." And we are most certainly entitled to look for effects in proportion to the loftiness of these assumptions. There could be no lack of teaching; for there was a priest for every two hundred inhabitants, throughout all France. One hundred and twenty thousand ecclesiastics, endowed with as much learning and pious zeal as the Holy Mother generally claims for her successors of the apostles, ought surely to wield a powerful influence in favor of religion, though in the midst of a gainsaying world. Doubtless, there were some pure and holy men in this multitude. But the character and the lives of many were such as not only to cover themselves with disgrace, but to bring religion itself into contempt.

In a race of beings, by nature "without God in the world," it is by no means uncommon to discover some, who, with all the advantages of the truth, and the "light which lighteth every man," are, nevertheless, desirous of remaining in their natural atheism; that, in the indulgence of their evil passions, they may not be annoyed by any gloomy apprehensions of future retribution. These are fond of looking upon religion in the concrete, rather than in the abstract; and the guilt and the folly of the individual are not only visited with merciless castigation, but his aberrations are charged upon his system itself. The French literati abounded in wits to whom this species of warfare was peculiarly grateful. And unfortunately for religion in general, Romanism was peculiarly assailable. On this subject, Father Barruel, for once, forgets his cassock and his wariness; and while seeking to describe the virulent and daring impiety with which the church was assaulted when the revolution had been fairly commenced, makes an unconscious revelation of the real state of that church. He complains, with much *naiveté*, of the endless charges of gross immorality which were preferred against the clergy; and anathematizes, with pious horror, the authors of the vile caricatures seen on every corner,

which represented monks and priests, clad in full canonicals, reveling in scenes of the lowest debauchery.

Undoubtedly, those who thus assaulted the clergy were not over scrupulous with regard to the justice of the accusation, provided it took effect in the minds of the people. It is true that they acted upon no principle but policy; but it would have been extremely impolitic to make such allegations, unless they were notoriously true. A base slander would have recoiled upon its fabricators with powerful effect. Would such caricatures, now posted up in New-York or Baltimore, alienate the affections of the laity, and render the Romish clergy a butt for infidel sarcasm? There was very little in French Catholicism to move the hearts, or lure the minds of men of intellect. The wits of the school of Voltaire and Condorcet laughed, when the fear of the rack was not before their eyes, at the august ceremonials of its worship,—its endless chants in mangled Latin, its bows, genuflections, and munificent offerings of smoke to wooden babies. The great men of the church had passed away. Bossuet slept with his fathers; and the eloquent voice of Bourdaloue was lost in the silence of the narrow house. Her Loyolas and Xaviers were no more; and Rome turned from the living, and, as is her wont, became a huckster in the bones and cast-off garments of the dead. She practices a rigid economy, which suffers nothing to be lost. Not only do her saints labor faithfully in the vineyard of the Lord while they live, but after they have gone to their reward, the paring of a finger-nail heals all manner of diseases; and even a shoe-latchet works miracles to the end of time. These pious marvels were a theme upon which the sarcastic assailants dilated with unmerciful ridicule, and, in all probability, with some exaggeration, to heighten the humor. They discoursed of the thirteen churches, each of which could boast of that inestimable treasure, the head of the same departed saint. They dwelt, with becoming gravity, upon the marvelous cures wrought by the most adorable of all relics, one of the groans of St. Stephen, which had been preserved by being carefully sealed in a bottle. If the Papal Church, with all this incubus resting upon her, had banished infidelity from the land, it would have been a far more miraculous exploit than that of the apostle of Erin, who drove the serpents into the ocean, from the summit of Crough Phadruig. Added to these vantages of the infidel assailants, there was another, which insured them the victory with greater infallibility than His Holiness ever possessed. The clergy, as a body, had incurred the bitter hatred of the people by their oppression.

Thus, when the seeds of irreligion were sown, very few fell by

the wayside, but into the good ground, a congenial soil, where they soon sprung up and brought forth their deadly fruit a hundredfold. And to this source may be traced the deepest shades of that moral darkness, which settled down upon France like a funeral pall. This was the monster that brought forth the fiendish deeds of the reign of terror. Atheism is essentially brutalizing. It is a vice alike destructive to individual happiness and national prosperity. All the humanizing sentiments, without which society is shorn of its advantages, and domestic life of its charms, sicken and die under its influence, while "shapes, hot from Tartarus," reign and riot in their stead. It is a deadly Upas, under whose blighting shade no flower blooms, nor herbage grows; and which the traveler cannot approach, without feeling its benumbing power stealing over his limbs and chilling the genial current of the blood.

Infidelity was widely disseminated among all classes by the hypocritical disquisitions of the encyclopedists; and the immorality of Voltaire, and the sentimental profligacy of Rousseau, found innumerable imitators among those who had not intellect enough to imitate them in anything else. Hypocrisy belongs, essentially, to no particular system of opinion. The philosopher of Fernay, and his co-adjutant worthies, could don the mask as well as the priests whose faith they scorned, and whose lives they denounced. These wily essayists did not at once make an open assault upon revelation, as honest men should attack what they conceived to be error. They first proceeded very cautiously to feel the pulse of the nation. When making their most malignant onsets, they would preface their dextrous sophistry with a doleful lamentation over the wide inconsistency which so unhappily existed between their most holy religion, and the voice of history, philosophy, and common sense. Thus they silently instilled their subtil poison into the very veins of the nation; and they threw aside the visor, when duplicity became a work of supererogation. The venom did its work. France was driven into a blind fury, that caused her to gnaw her own flesh in her madness. The ignorant multitude, already brutalized by oppression, had destroyed all earthly authority. They had struck off the head of their sovereign, and, with cannibal ferocity, had torn open the royal tomb of the Capets, and danced upon the bones of his fathers. And now they were assured that the idea of a God was but the phantom of a weak brain. Thus they plunged into the joyous commission of the greatest enormities, neither fearing God nor regarding man.

That which gave the revolution its fierce and sanguinary character, also hurried their political schemes on to a ruinous failure.

The French had not the material of a republic. They were destitute of the elements of freedom. Darkness covered the land, and gross darkness the people. The physical sciences, indeed, flourished among the academicians; and many great advances were made. Mathematics, in particular, was much cultivated. And if liberty, instead of being the golden rule applied to government, had happened to be a rhomboid or an asymptote, the French would have been able to comprehend its nature. But they could neither mete it out by applying the equation of a straight line, nor get it into their crucibles; and its mysteries remained absolutely impenetrable to their understandings. The convention even abolished the academy; and when one of its brightest ornaments, Lavoisier, sought two or three days' respite from the guillotine, that he might perfect a discovery, he was consoled with the kind information, that "the republic had no need of philosophers."

A free government must be firmly based upon intelligence and sound morality: but the ignorance and caprice of the multitude made them an unsafe foundation for a structure requiring so great strength and solidity of material. The revolution was the wild attempt of men goaded to madness by a crushing tyranny. In a moment of popular fury, they hurled their hated tormentors to the earth, and made the dangerous experiment of self-government. A few of the loftier intellects of the nation may have had some faint conceptions of the true theory of government, and the essentials of success: but the mass, reckless and inconstant, frustrated their projects and disappointed their hopes. They imagined that the noble structure which they had reared, apparently so firm and massive, would lift its towering summit to the clouds for the wondering gaze of many generations to come; but while they were yet singing their pæans of joy for its erection, it fell thundering to the dust, and overwhelmed the miserable builders in the wide-spread ruin. It had been built upon the sand of popular tumult, rather than upon the rock of sound free principles.

C.

ARTICLE III.—*The Citizen of a Republic: what are his Rights, his Duties, and Privileges, and what should be his Education.* By ANSALDO CEBA, *a Genoese Republican of the Sixteenth Century. Translated and edited by* C. EDWARDS LESTER, *Translator of The Challenge of Barletta, The Florentine Histories, &c., Honorary Member of the Imperial and Royal Athenæum of Florence.* Pp. 190. New-York: Paine and Burgess, 62 John-street. 1845. *The Medici Series of Italian Prose,* No. 4.

THE attempt to ascertain what are the elements essential to the existence and prosperity of a republic is unquestionably one of the most important duties devolving on a citizen. A republic that is destitute of any of these elements is exposed to peculiar danger from that very system of checks and balances in which the peculiar value of this form of polity consists. In other forms of government, where the joints and ligaments of civil organization are more massive and inflexible, certain elements of the body politic may be wanting with less immediate disastrous effect, on account of the compactness and strength of the system. The same iron framework that prevents growth and expansion, may also prevent the immediate effects of decrepitude and decay, and may maintain unbroken and erect that which at heart is but rottenness and ruin. But to a republic the problem of existence is a Sphinx riddle, whose conditions are solution or destruction. If any essential factor is left out of the solvent, the dire alternative must be met. Existing as it does, a machinery of such mighty energy, and such manifold parts, the very might of that energy will be the measure of its ruin, should any essential parts be omitted in its structure. Hence to ascertain these essential parts is manifestly of the last importance to those in whose hands the destinies of the republic are deposited.

It is equally manifest that among the most important of these conditions is the character of the citizens themselves. Good laws and institutions are necessary; but good citizens will be much more likely to create good laws, than good laws to create good citizens. "Make the tree good, and the fruit will be good." It is therefore not difficult to perceive that it is in the character of the citizens of a republic, rather than in anything external and formal, that these essential elements must be found. Hence this has been usually the subject most carefully pondered by those calm and thoughtful minds whose patriotism is something more than the

horse-leech adhesiveness of party feeling, and whose preparation for the duties of civil life is something more than that nimble dexterity which enables its possessor always to ride the crest of the wave.

Such was the feeling of the Genoese republican, whose work is before us. Having served his country in various capacities; having shared her brilliant and changeful fortunes in an eventful period of her history; having attained some eminence, not only as a statesman, but as a writer; and having thus the combined advantages of matured experience, extensive observation, and cultivated intellect, to qualify him for the post of a political mentor, he leaves as his most valuable legacy to his countrymen the ripened views of his old age as to the proper character of the citizen of a republic.

This treatise contains much that is of general value and importance, with somewhat that is less adapted to the altered tastes and circumstances of more modern society; brought together without much apparent regard to exact logical method or scientific arrangement. It consists of sixty-five brief chapters; to which the translator has prefixed a dedication to the Hon. J. Q. Adams, with a short and somewhat vague introductory notice of Ceba and his times; and added notes, rendering into English most of the quotations from foreign languages with which, in accordance with the taste of the age, the book is freely interlarded. After some preliminary chapters, showing the necessity and design of political education, and some presupposed qualities and virtues that are requisite in the citizen to be formed, the writer proceeds to define virtue. His definition is made so wide as to comprehend both intellectual and moral excellence. Under what are termed intellectual virtues are ranked, in order, a knowledge of languages, rhetoric, moral philosophy, history, the art of war, poetry, natural philosophy, mathematics, and what is termed practical intellect, or the ability to govern a man's self, his family, and the state. In his delineation of moral virtues, after declaring the possession of Christian graces to be a necessary substratum, he teaches that the citizen should be firm, temperate, liberal, magnificent, magnanimous, moderate in seeking honors, mild, constant, just, clement, heroic, and in what way these virtues are to be acquired, preserved, and exercised.

The following extract from the chapter on clemency will at once present a specimen of our author's style of thought and expression, and convey a merited rebuke to that mawkish sentimentalism so prevalent in our day, that is more merciful than God himself, and

forgets, in its maudlin weepings over the criminal, the hapless victims of his crime, the trampled laws, and the periled interests, and outraged moral sense of society.

"If those tribunals, which are so ready to show compassion to the vile, would remember, that in letting one villain escape they are the immediate instruments of bringing evil directly on many innocent persons, as Pythagoras says, they would confess themselves worthy of any other name in the world rather than merciful. Let the citizen, then, beware of being deceived by the similitude of names. Let him not mistake severity for cruelty, or weakness for clemency; but esteem himself clement or severe when motives of equity or public good call for a light or a heavy punishment. He will esteem that man weak or cruel when, without regard to either, he shall imitate the indulgence of Scipio toward the crimes of Pleminius, or the atrocity of the Carthaginians in the torments they inflicted upon Attilius Regulus. He who gives away the goods of others, rather than his own, cannot properly be called liberal; neither can he be called clement who takes away from the public its security, by showing compassion to a single individual: and whether he be an executor of the law, or clothed with arbitrary power, let him remember he is a dispenser of the goods of others, and let him distribute them on just principles, following, in the one case, the letter of the law, and in the other conforming his will to the public good, waiting for the time to come when he can make a sacrifice of himself without detriment to others. Then with the most exalted praise, without confining himself within any prescribed limits, he may pardon injuries, remit punishments, repay kindnesses twofold, and make those magnificent demonstrations which only friends are wont to show toward each other. And if, in executing punishment for public injuries, he shall feel he is violating any of the principles of Christian charity, it will aid him to remember the declaration of Augustin, that to show mercy when punishment ought to be inflicted, is not *charity*, but *infirmity*. If any one would maintain the opposite cause to win the reputation of benignity, let him remember the reply of Carlaus, king of Sparta, to one who praised him: 'I should not be a good man if I were not merciless toward villains.' If he would console himself with the flattering idea of pity, let him remember that this sentiment is rather the attribute of a weak mind, than proof of a brave heart; for clemency is shown, not because the judge is under the control of compassion, which, although in some respects praiseworthy, in spite of the Stoics, yet, in the judicial trial, it should, if possible, be plucked up by the roots; for clemency can be practiced and cruelty avoided without indulging pity."—Pp. 88, 89.

He then prescribes some natural advantages and gifts of fortune which are necessary to enable the citizen to reduce to practice the moral virtues already described. The natural advantages are physical health, robustness, and beauty. In laying down the means of acquiring these physical advantages, we cannot forbear noticing

the fact, that our author, although nurtured beneath the sunny skies and surrounded by the luxurious influences of Italy, seems most cynically insensible to the advantages of one means of physical cultivation, very highly valued by some in our day, for we find him declaring,—

"And we protest, that under the name of leaping, we have not designed to embrace *dancing*, which serves rather to render the mind weak and effeminate, than to make the body active and sprightly, as those dances seem to have been which Aristotle tells us were reproved in Callipides, and others who, in going through them, minced like prostitutes in the street. Gregory Nazianzen, in a canzone, calls them the tripping of effeminate boys, who never had a manly movement."—P. 93.

Among the advantages of fortune he enumerates nobility, riches, good name among the people, honor, children, (whose physical, intellectual, and moral education he strongly urges,) civil power, and friends. He then describes the means of acquiring the favor of others, and enjoins on the citizen the cultivation of the art of pleasing, veracity, and cheerfulness in the ordinary intercourse of society.

The remainder of the book consists of miscellaneous directions concerning his conduct, instructing him how to act in private companies; how to conduct himself in places of public resort for amusement and entertainment; warning him against gaming and libidinous indulgences; directing him how to hold intercourse with his own countrymen and foreigners in the several relations of public and private life; how to act in various circumstances described; and recommending him to spend the first twenty-four years of his life in careful study and education for his duties, and the succeeding six in foreign travel, preparatory to his entrance on the active duties of civil life.

In concluding this portrait of the character of a good citizen, he says,—

"In counsel and action he will regard the glory of God; for without the steady guiding-star of Christian principle, he will never accomplish any work that can have an efficacious power to confer lasting prosperity upon the republic; and this is the end we have endeavored, as far as God has given us light, he should keep in view."—P. 176.

This homage to Christianity and the Bible is of course gratifying to every Christian heart, as a just tribute of respect, too rarely rendered by the mere politician. It is manifest, however, that neither in this treatise, nor in political treatises generally, is there recognized anything more than a mere general relation of Christi-

anity and the Bible to free institutions. They are often admitted as valuable auxiliaries in the performance of political duties, but rarely regarded as actual sources of political rights. It is plain, however, that if they occupy both of these relations, the knowledge and recognition of this twofold character are important to the right discharge of political duty. The man who knows not the sources whence he has derived his civil rights and privileges, is incapable either of properly estimating or rightly preserving them. He cannot fully appreciate them, because he knows not the price at which they have been purchased, or the height from which they have been brought. He cannot properly preserve them, for in his ignorance he may close up the very fountain from whose stream he has been drinking, and extinguish the very torch by whose light he has been walking. If they have an origin higher than mere human expediency, they have also a value superior to a mere human invention. If they have been given to us by means more potent and pure than the theories of the statesman, or the tactics of the soldier, they cannot surely be retained if those means are undervalued or rejected. An inquiry into the nature of the elements historically and logically entering into the composition of free institutions, will form an appropriate sequel, if not a necessary counterpart and complement, to a delineation of their accompanying duties.

In making such an investigation, the mind that believes in the great fact, that God has made a revelation of his will to his creatures, will naturally desire to extend its researches in that direction. A revelation from the Source of all truth, and the Author of all being, will of course contain the truth that is necessary for those beings to whom it is given. And although that revelation may have been given for a specific purpose, yet it may furnish principles or foster feelings that have a wider scope than the main object to which it is directed. Hence the man who regards the Bible as his only rule of faith and practice, and who cherishes also a preference for a republican form of government, will be anxious to know whether such a form of civil polity is authorized by the unerring word: or, if authorized, whether there is anything more than a mere warrant—anything that seems like a harmony or unison of the principles imbodied in each: or, finally, whether there is such an adaptation of the one to the other, that the religion taught in the one will find its most natural seat in a government imbodying the form and spirit of the other; and even tend gradually, so far as its influence extends to matters of mere political arrangement, actually to produce this particular form of civil society.

The consideration of questions like these becomes the more

necessary, from the peculiar position into which religion has been forced in the history of our government. We have so completely divorced church and state, that we are almost disposed to regard any connection between politics and religion as incestuous. So far from recognizing any obligation to, or connection with, the Bible or its Author, in our federal Constitution, we have not even hinted at the existence of God, or enabled the future historian to determine, from our supreme national act, whether we were a nation of atheists, pagans, or infidels. If the politician has admitted the truth or importance of religion at all, it has been rather as something to fit men to die, than prepare them to live; or if it have any close and active connection with life, as something that is too impalpable, sensitive, and hallowed, to have any connection whatever with the rude and boisterous movements of politics. They have regarded the Bible as merely *coexisting passively* with our form of government, but having no more actual influence upon it, or affinity with it, than it ever has had in any other form of civil government. Indeed, on the part of some there has been a lurking suspicion, that if the Bible exerted any influence at all in this matter, that influence was rather hostile than friendly to this form of civil polity. And from the deep mouth of infidelity and irreligion, not only in the bloody frensy of the French Revolution, but in the muzzled form in which they growl and snarl in our midst, the charge has been loudly and repeatedly made, that the Bible is the foe of genuine freedom, and the ready tool of kingly and priestly tyranny, and that its destruction will be the jubilee of liberty, and the rights of man.

Having, in the preceding number of this work, endeavored to show that the Reformation was the source of American liberty, we propose to inquire whether there is any general principle involved in this particular case—whether this result was merely accidental, or whether it was what we might justly have expected from the nature of genuine liberty, and the religion of the word of God. In other words, we propose, in view of the considerations already urged, to examine *the republican tendency of the Bible.* Assuming, therefore, that the terms of this proposition are sufficiently explicit without any formal definition, we proceed directly to the inquiry thus suggested, without any extended preliminary explanations.

In propounding this subject, we do not mean to assert that the Bible is a text-book of political science. It was given primarily and mainly, not to build up or throw down any system of political or metaphysical philosophy, but to save a world from hell: not to ordain, arbitrarily, any particular social forms, but to soften and

ameliorate all, by leading men from everything earthly and devilish to the communion of everything heavenly and divine. But it is a characteristic of the works of God in which they usually differ from those of man, that while they gain one or more great ends as the prime objects of their existence, they also secure certain subsidiary results with equal certainty. Thus the sun and the air, besides accomplishing the great ends of their existence, effect also many other minor results of great importance to the human race. In like manner the word of God, which is at once the sun of the moral world that gives it light, and the atmosphere that wraps it in beauty, while its main object is to save sinners through Jesus Christ, yet, with that characteristic richness of influence that marks all the works of its great Author, accomplishes many other subordinate ends in every department of human thought and action. One of these departments we believe to be civil government: and our object is simply to develop the nature of that influence in reference to that form called republican.

Our first proposition is, that the general influence of the Bible is not only favorable, but absolutely indispensable, to the permanent existence of a republic.

If we examine the causes that have produced the downfall of former republics, we may refer them all to three general sources, the head, the hand, and the heart; or the intellectual, physical, and moral power of the nation. As these include all the possible sources of power that either a nation or a man can possess, they must therefore exhaust all the possible sources of weakness from which they can suffer. What then has been the influence of the Bible on these sources of strength and weakness?

And, first, we inquire as to *the head*. Intelligence is indispensable to the enjoyment of free institutions. An ignorant people cannot long be a free people. A republic without intelligence would be like an army of blind men—more formidable and dangerous to themselves and their friends than to their enemies. What then is the relation of the Bible to the cultivation of national mind? It is to the Bible and to Christianity that we owe nearly all the learning of the world for fifteen hundred years; and to them especially that we owe the education of the general mass of society. Greece, Rome, Egypt, and India, in the palmy days of their paganism, had their learned men, their giant intellects, their wise statesmen; but when were their lower classes instructed? When did their priests, their orators, their statesmen, and their scholars, attempt anything like a system of common-school instruction? Did they not regard the people as mere beasts of burden, to

work, and fight, and die for them? Was not the *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* of the poet their prevailing sentiment? It is to Christianity that the education of the masses is mainly to be referred. As soon as the church became fairly established in the world, her attention was directed to this subject; and from Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, there went forth streams more full of healing virtue to the faint and thirsty souls of the poor and the lowly, than all the waters that ever gushed in crystal beauty from the Castalian fount. These fountains, however, were but the filtered gatherings of that gentle influence, distilled from heaven, that had long been percolating and diffusing itself through the hidden masses of society, and only found in these schools a vent and channel for its waters. During the long, dark night of the middle ages, the church, with her monasteries and holy places, was the repository of learning. She guarded the relics of classic lore, even though she slept over them while guarding them, when all others undervalued them; and though herself greatly behind what she ought to have been, yet she was greatly before every other institution among men. While emperors, lords, and chieftains, neither knew their alphabet, nor could write their names, and despised all who could; and while the rude and warlike spirit of the age looked down with barbaric pride on learning as enervating, effeminate, and unmanly, the church was keeping alive those glimmering sparks that were one day to flame out and illumine the world. And at the revival of learning, they who were foremost in the work were found in the church. Wickliffe, Huss, Petrarch, Boccacce, Erasmus, Ximenes, Luther, Calvin, Knox, Usher, and many others of the brightest ray in that glorious morning constellation that at once gilded and broke the long night of the world's darkness, were the sons of the church. Nor was this a mere accident, with no relation to the Bible; for the men who were the advocates of learning were, with scarcely an exception, the men who studied and loved the Bible. The men, both in the church and out of it, who opposed the resurrection of the human mind, were as ignorant of the Bible as they were of anything else. And since that time we challenge the world to point to a single community, distinguished by a love of the Bible, which has not been also marked by superior intelligence and expansion of mind. And with all the learning and science that infidelity can boast, the brightest names in the history of beneficent learning, in the founding of schools, the endowment of colleges, and the impartation of instruction, are names that are written in the Lamb's book of life. Wherever the church is found, there is the school; and the schoolmaster and preacher go hand in hand.

Is this a mere accident? Does not the Bible command and teach him who reads and loves it to think? Does it not even force him to think and reason by its peculiar doctrines, its sublime revelations, and its very difficulties and obscurities? And must not this process lead to general intelligence? If, therefore, the Bible is read and loved in a community, that community will possess sufficient intelligence to be free.

But suppose we have reached this point in a republic, is that sufficient? Will mere intelligence preserve its existence? Is it only necessary for men to know their duty to induce them to do it? Are the most shrewd and intelligent voters and politicians always the safest? And if a man is guided merely by intelligent expediency, can his intelligence always inform him what *is* expedient? And may not passion and interest in a community sometimes blind reason and judgment? Will it not especially be so in those times of factious excitement and revolution, in the vortex of which the republic is usually engulfed? Was it the mere lack of intelligence that destroyed Athens, Sparta, Rome, Venice, the Italian, or French republics? Was not the richest and brightest hour of their literary history—the period when the most mellow and gorgeous light of intellect mantled their horizon—the hour of these republics' setting sun? Was there not with them a deficiency of heart, as well as of head? Do not these facts show that virtue, a high and deathless love of the right and the true, is equally indispensable to a republic? Will this point bear an argument? Must not stupidity itself perceive, that as long as the mass of a government remain sternly and unflinchingly virtuous, that government is safe, while, if they are depraved and vicious, it is equally unsafe?

If this education of the heart be so necessary, where will we find it, if we cast away the Bible? What other book or institution is there that sets up even the slightest well-grounded pretence to the impartation of this kind of education? And is not this adequate to the end? Though written by plain and unpretending men, it has gone forth into the depths of society, an angel of light, to purge its pollution, and lighten its gloom. It has descended into the hovel of poverty, where squalid wretchedness would seem to furnish at once the temptation and the apology for crime, and taught the lowly occupant of that humble roof what has raised him to a kingly majesty of soul. It has caused him to forget the lowliness of his dwelling, in the contemplation of that royal palace above, the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. It has taught him to forget the cold and haughty glance of heartless pride, and the iron grasp of unfeeling extortion, in the mellow light of that calm

and benignant Eye above, whose kind and tranquil gaze, like the pure light of the sun, that rests alike on cottage and palace, comes down as sweetly on him as it does on the proudest monarch that rules and curses the earth. It has gone up into the rich man's mansion betimes, and, dashing down the miserable vanity of wealth and rank that ruled while it hardened his heart, has taught him to value more those riches that come not as often to curse as to bless; and plume himself less on these tinsel trappings that as often mark the buffoon of society as its ornament. It has descended to the lurking place of the hardened wretch, who is a very patriarch in crime, whose shameless brow and cowering eye bespeak at once conscious guilt and reckless despair; and, seizing hold of all that is human in his heart, lifted him to somewhat divine, raising him from despair to hope, from hope to faith, and thence to the virtue, peace, and strength of believing. There is no condition so abjectly low, that it cannot descend and bring up its hapless occupant to virtue and purity. There is no position so lofty, that it cannot ascend and bring down its haughty possessor to the equity and equality of the gospel. There is no stronghold of vice so impregnable, that it cannot scale and conquer, and even transform it into a temple for the most high God. Whatever be the means for improving the head, the Bible is, beyond all question, the instrument for renovating the heart. If, then, the heart of a nation must be pure to preserve its existence, the Bible is the palladium of a republic.

But there is a strength of the hand necessary to a government; a certain amount of physical power and courage required to girdle its institutions with strong arms and brave hearts, and protect them in an hour of peril. It may at first sight seem that the Bible tends to wither the robust and hardy virtues of a nation, by inculcating forbearance and forgiveness, and thus make a timid and cowardly people. Indeed, the charge has been openly made on the floor of our national congress, and a lame attempt made at its defense. It is true, the Bible teaches forgiveness and peace, while it abhors war and bloodshed. By teaching the great truths of human brotherhood, it makes war a fratricide. But does this unman its disciples, or teach them to be effeminate and cowardly? Do the virtue and temperance of the Bible produce no effect in stringing the nerve and muscle, cooling and clearing the brain, increasing the productive capital, and giving energy even to the physical power of a people? Does it not tend to destroy that luxury that destroys more national strength than gunpowder? And does it not breathe a loftier endurance of pain, and a sublimer contempt of death, than

ever fired the heart of a hero, or steeled the soul of a Stoic? Have not its followers meekly and uncomplainingly endured the sufferings of poverty, bereavement, disease, and neglect, with a bravery more heroic than that of the battle-field? Have they not, without a murmur and without a complaint, calmly and meekly suffered for their cherished principles, when a word might have saved them? Have not their ferocious persecutors seen the tottering frame of age, and the blooming form of youth, go to the block, the cross, the torture, and the dungeon, as serenely as to the festal board? Have they not seen tender and delicate maidens, braving the yellings of an infuriated rabble with an unquailing eye of intrepidity, and playing with the hissing and bickering flames as joyfully as if they had been the silken breathings of the zephyr? Is it said that this is mere passive courage, and not the feeling that fits men for the fierce tumults of the battle-field? Then we have facts sufficient to meet the evasion. Who were braver men than the Christian legions of the Antonines and Constantine? Who more undaunted in the red revelry of battle than the gospel-loving Swiss? And have we forgotten the iron band of Cromwell, the high-hearted Puritans, those men of adamant, who trampled to the earth the plumed and haughty chivalry of England as if they had been tinseled boys? And the Scots Cameronians, as they dyed the heather of their native hills with a bravery that extorted admiration from Marlboro himself? And the troops of Gustavus, the noble Swede, who, going forth to the field of battle from their knees, made Europe ring with plaudits of their bravery? And the psalm-singers and Methodists of Nelson, who showed, amid the frightful crashing of "the broadside's reeling rack," and the dreadful carnage of the slippery deck, that there was a mightier principle of heroism than the mere bravery of madness? And the Gardiners, the Washingtons, and the countless others who have shown that the union of bravery and piety did not cease with the Joshuas, the Gideons, and the Davids of the olden time? These facts undoubtedly prove, that while Christianity abhors the cold-blooded savage, who selects and pursues his work of slaughter precisely as the butcher plies his trade, it teaches an unflinching bravery, a lofty contempt of danger, and a fearless daring of death, in defense of the right, that are far more available and enduring in their cool and steady aim than the most violent impulses of blind and thoughtless bravery: and that the man who regards death with feelings of hope and joy, is at least as available in the hour of conflict as the man who either thinks of it with despair, or refuses to think of it at all. Hence we may safely conclude that the Bible, whether we look at

its influence on the head, the heart, or the hand, is an indispensable requisite, in its general aspect, to the permanent existence of a republic.

The argument from this train of thought may thus be summed up:—Whatever tends to remove the grounds of one institution, and establish the grounds of another, may fairly be claimed as hostile to the one and favorable to the other. The great argument for monarchical or oligarchical institutions is, that the people are incapable, in head, heart, or hand, of that amount of self-government implied in a republic; that they cannot discern the best line of policy; that even if they could discern it, they are usually so corrupt as not to adopt it; and that even were they both able and willing to choose the best policy, they need a more powerful executive agency than any that they can create by mere temporary delegation, and hence that they need a stronger form of government than that of a republic. Now as the Bible tends to prepare a people for self-government in all these respects, and thus to remove all plea of necessity and all ground of argument in favor of absolute governments, its influence will be gradually to remove all such forms of polity from the earth, or at least so to modify their features as to render them in fact equivalent to freer and more liberal systems of civil rule. *Cessante ratione cessat ipsa lex* is not only a maxim of law, but a formula of history and human progress. As the embryo spirit of humanity is developed, its *larva* and *chrysalis* integuments must gradually give place to the forms of a higher and more perfect life. The inference then is immediate and irresistible, that the influence of the Bible is decidedly republican. The same line of argument that proves common-school instruction to be republican in its tendency, because of its preparative and conservative influence in such a form of government, will, *a fortiori*, prove the republican tendency of the Bible.

But beyond this general tendency it has a particular influence that is still more eminently republican. The fundamental doctrines of republicanism may, with scarcely an exception, be found in the Bible. The creed of republicanism is, "that all men are born free and equal, and endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." There is not an item of this creed, so far as it conveys the right truth in the right terms touching the matter, that may not be drawn directly from the fountain of inspiration. Let us look for a moment at the identity between the teachings of the *magna charta* of Christianity, and the *magna charta* of modern republicanism.

Their teachings are identical on the fundamental principle of

free institutions, the natural equality of man. This is inculcated throughout the Bible in a variety of forms, and enforced by a variety of considerations.

The authoritative command of the Scripture of truth is, "As ye would that others should do unto you, do ye also unto them." Here we have our own rights and feelings made the standard of our conduct to others. But can this be true on any other hypothesis than that the rights and feelings of others, similarly situated, are the same with our own? If our rights constitute the measure of that treatment which others may demand at our hand, is not this proof positive that our rights and theirs *mutatis mutandis* are identical? If we dare not do to another what another dare not do to us, are we not on the most absolute equality? And if this rule is binding *semper, ubique, et super omnes,* does it not place all men on the same platform of sheer equality? Does not this one pervading, and indeed fontal principle of ethics that runs through the entire word of God, sweep away, with cataract force, all usurpation, all oppression, all tyranny, all that prerogative claimed by kings and nobles to ride booted and spurred over the great mass of humanity, trampling them down at their will? Could a despotism exist, on whose ponderous wheels was engraven the golden rule? Would not the universal adoption of this rule, as a principle of action, gradually undermine every form of oppression, and establish government on the broad and rightful basis of human equality? What is liberty but justice to all? And what is the Bible but a code of this universal justice? Such then being the fact, the influence of the Bible must necessarily be toward republicanism.

The recognition of this great truth of human equality is made also in the fact, that the Bible frowns upon all those distinctions in society that tend to foster a claim of arrogant superiority. It is true, the Bible gives no countenance to that sweeping and leveling spirit of radicalism, that would prostrate all distinctions in society, and place all in the same circumstances precisely. This is the very essence of despotism, applying, as it does, with a Procrustean tyranny, and more than a Procrustean folly, the stunted and distorted measure of its own dwarfish stature as the standard to which all are to be cut down, compressed, and forcibly retained, whatever be the free tendencies of their nature. Equality is not sameness, nor is liberty leveling. Hence the Bible does not require the rich man to become poor, or the poor man to become mendicant; the learned man to become ignorant, or the intellectual man to become stupid; or indeed any man to forsake the natural sphere he occupies, in order to disturb the subordinate relations that make up the

harmonious structure of human society, and gain the equality of Sans-Culotteism, Owenism, or Fourierism. It recognizes these inequalities, but it admits them only as inequalities of relation. It teaches that behind, and beneath, and above all these, the man is the same wherever you find him, and possesses equal rights, according to his relations; and that no man dare claim any right to lord it over his fellow because of these temporary and factitious relations. "The rank is but the guinea stamp, the man's the goud for a' that." It teaches that there is in man, as a living and moral creature, a dignity that overshadows infinitely all earthly and temporary distinctions. That sublime problem in the arithmetic of eternity, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul!" contains within it the very ground principle of human equality, and the corner-stone of democracy. It is the possession of this magnificent boon of immortality, the priceless treasure of a deathless spirit, that is found alike in the meanest slave and the mightiest monarch; a spirit that shall exist to flame as a seraph, or glare as a fiend, when the earth, with its gorgeous palaces, its glittering cities, its storied plains, and its beetling mountains, shall be wrapped in its winding-sheet of flame, and laid in the tomb of chaos;—it is this glorious spark of divine life in the human constitution that riches cannot purchase, tyrants cannot reach, and power cannot fetter, that establishes the universal dignity of human nature, and the universal equality of human rights, on an immovable basis.

A Persian prince, who had been taught to look upon his fellowmen but as so many machines to minister to his pleasure, and to regard them with haughty contempt, because their veins were not filled with the blood of royalty, was placed beneath the tutelage of one of those wise and thoughtful men, whose learning and care had made Egypt the cradle of science, and the mother of philosophy. Before the hoary sage attempted an open correction of this foolish pride, he led him forth to view some of the stupendous piles of architecture that lift their Alpine masses of masonry throughout that wonderful and mysterious land. The Persian had seen the effeminate and airy structures of his luxurious clime, but his eye had never fallen upon the gigantic and frowning piles of Egyptian art that now loomed in their awful majesty before him. In silence he gazed on the sweeping collonades that stretched away until lost in the distance; the mighty propyla that stood before him in peerless grandeur; the towering ceilings that lifted themselves in their dizzy height, until they seemed to hang from heaven; the massive columns that reared their ponderous shafts, until they seemed to

taper to a point, and the stupendous aggregate of those wonderful temples, whose area was measured by acres rather than by feet; and when his soul had dilated to grasp the mighty conceptions there imbodied, he turned to his guide to inquire what godlike beings had reared such structures as these. The lofty reply of the sage was received into an humbler and wiser heart than before, as he said, "Remember, my son, that all this, and a thousand fold more, was imbodied and created in the human mind ere ever it was erected by the human hand; and that this is the work of the being on whom you thus trample with haughty contempt." In a still loftier spirit, and with a purer truth, does the Bible take the pampered lordling, who would vaunt his petty superiority over his dependent fellows, and, lifting the curtain that veils the future, point him to the glittering turrets of "that city that hath foundations," with its gleaming walls, and its flashing portals, and its streets all lustrous with the light of immortality; and when his rapt spirit has drunk in some of its far-off and unearthly beauty, it whispers to him, "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" In that kingdom "the rich and the poor meet together, and God is the Maker of them all." There the meanest and the mightiest shall all stand on one great platform of equality, where the dignity of rank and of title will be lost in the loftier dignity of *man*, as the immortal denizen of heaven.

The doctrines and institutions of religion know nothing of the factitious distinctions of human society. It was remarked by one of England's deepest thinkers, that "a church is the only real democracy on earth." Whether the only democracy or not, it at least imbodies most important democratic principles. It can rightly recognize no distinction between rich and poor, noble and base-born. There is but one character, that of sinners; but one way to God, Jesus Christ; but one heaven to be gained, and one hell avoided; but one life stretching away toward eternity, and but one grave in which all at last shall lie down; and the dust that sleeps in the lowly and nameless hillock shall rest as sweetly as that which reposes beneath the proudest monumental pile. All are alike ignorant, frail, and erring; and the soul of the humble child of poverty is as precious and priceless in the eye of Him who carries the lambs in his bosom, as the soul of the scion of royalty. The Redeemer died not for the one more fully than the other: the sanctifying Spirit enters not the heart of the one more freely than the other. Indeed, so far from the Bible tending to favor the claims of the rich and great to grasping usurpation, the very mark

that distinguishes the Christian dispensation is, that "to the poor the gospel is preached." And in the history of its reception the record is, "For ye know your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty, and base things of the world, and things that are despised hath God chosen, yea, and things that are not, to bring to naught things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence." Does the rich man plume himself on his wealth, and despise his poorer neighbor? its language is, "Wo unto you rich, for you have your consolation! God accepteth not the persons of princes, nor regardeth the rich more than the poor. Will he esteem thy riches? No; not gold, nor all the forces of strength, for riches profit not in the day of wrath." Is the pride of ancestry the ground of claim? its language to the silly claimant of honor, because his ancestors were worthier than he, is, "Who hath made thee to differ? Did not he who formed thee in the womb, form also them? God formed of one blood all nations of men to dwell upon the earth." Is it because of some hereditary claim to office? its declaration is, "Be not lords over God's heritage. Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them; but it shall not be so among you,—he that is greatest among you let him be a servant."

The declaration of the great Founder of Christianity is, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." His example was but the counterpart of his teaching. Though the Lord of heaven and earth, he came not in the purple and gold of royalty, or the splendid insignia of power, but in the form of a servant, born and nurtured in poverty, the carpenter's son, and the lowly, despised Nazarene. His followers were chosen, not from the proud hierarchy of Jerusalem, the haughty nobility of Rome, or the stately literati of Athens; but from the poor, the humble, the despised; from the fishermen of Galilee, and the publicans of Judea. A poor man himself, though Lord of all, he became at once the poor man's model, and the poor man's friend: and the glorious legacy that he left behind him in the Bible is the charter of the poor man's rights. If, then, the great doctrine of the word of God concerning the human race in this matter is the equality of its members; if it throws the shield of its protection around the poor, the humble, and the defenseless, and tramples under foot the pretensions of power,

riches, and family pride, its doctrines are identical with those of republicanism, and its influence, wherever it is wrought into the texture of a community, must therefore be essentially republican.

But we go further, and alledge, that not only is the Bible identical in its teachings with republicanism, but where any leanings are to be seen toward or against any particular structure of civil polity, they are unfavorable, rather than otherwise, to monarchy and despotism of any form.

One of the most decided characteristics of the word of God is, its tendency to promote a legitimate freedom of thought, which necessarily implies a corresponding freedom of action. While it gives no countenance to that foolish fantasy of the human mind, that refuses to admit any truth that cannot be supported by physical or mathematical evidence, it at the same time asks no one to receive its doctrines but on proper and legitimate proof. Its spirit has been beautifully and tersely expressed by one of its most illustrious ornaments more than a thousand years ago: "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity." It commands us to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." When it enjoins us to seek "that liberty with which Christ makes his people free," it at the same time prescribes the means of obtaining it, by declaring, "The truth shall make you free." This freedom of the truth demands for its perfect enjoyment the untrammeled exercise of the voluntary powers in the formation and expression of opinion. It denies the right of any one man, or set of men, whether they claim kingly or priestly authority for so doing, to think for any other men without their own consent, for the simple reason, that all men are responsible agents, each held accountable for the exercise of his own powers. That arrogance of despotism, whether civil or ecclesiastical, which refuses freedom of thought and speech to the people, has its origin elsewhere than in the Bible. If, then, tyranny and restraint are wrong in things spiritual, can they be right in things civil? And if the Bible, both by precept and example, teaches the right of the people to think and act for themselves in religion, will not the inference follow irresistibly, that they have the same right in politics? And if it rejects indignantly the claim of the hierarchy to dictate to men on the greatest and most mysterious topics of human thought, will it not teach as indignant a rejection of a similar claim in the throne? And as the throne can only rest on such a claim, while the fundamental principles of a republic assert that freedom of thought, speech, and action, belong to the people, and are rightfully to be

exercised in the matter of civil government; the influence of the Bible must be adverse to the one, and friendly to the other.

A closer examination of the language of the Bible will convince us that it has no sympathy whatever with assumptions of arbitrary power. The very spirit of liberty breathes through its poetry and eloquence. Where do we find more lofty, burning, and indignant strains of invective against oppression than are contained in some of the noble lyrics of the Bible? The pages of ancient and modern song will be searched in vain to find a superior in magnificence of diction, sublimity of style, and, above all, ardent and quenchless hatred of tyranny, to that grand triumphal ode contained in the fourteenth chapter of Isaiah, in which, with a melody as deep and dirge-like as the mighty anthem of the ocean, the prophet bard wakes his lofty lyre to pour forth the exulting requiem of oppressive and blood-stained Babylon. "Hell from beneath is moved to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up all her dead, the princes and chief ones of the earth;"—as if to intimate that the grim shades of departed tyrants were allowed a horrible revel, a kind of hellish jubilee, as another was added to their number; and that the knell of another tyranny was mingled with the howlings of fiends eager for their new victims.

The very symbol for a king or a monarchy in prophecy is not destitute of significance. It is true, we cannot found any great weight of argument on this fact, owing to the obscurity that rests on the entire doctrine of symbols: but still it is manifest, that some resemblance, more or less, exists between the symbol and the thing symbolized. Thus the Messiah is symbolized by a lion and a lamb, to indicate prominent, and almost opposite, attributes in his character. The symbol of a king or monarchy we find usually to be a beast, and not a domestic or useful animal, but a wild beast, fierce, heartless, and cruel; thirsting for blood and rapine; gorged with innocent flesh; greedy of spoil; living by plunder and treachery; solitary, grim, and suspicious; prowling in the darkness, and hating the light. The last of the four great monarchies of the earth, imperial Rome, which yet continues to exist on the earth in a divided form, was especially revolting—dark, stern, iron-teethed, pitiless, relentless, and ferocious; stamping under foot the helpless and defenseless; hated of man, and accursed of God. The question is at least worthy of consideration, whether, had such systems been regarded as blessings, they would have been set forth by such a symbol; and whether the adoption of such imagery does not indicate an unfavorable estimate of those to whom it was applied to describe their destinies.

But the actual predictions of these prophecies evince this point still more distinctly. It is declared in that mystic chart of the world's history, that but four great overshadowing monarchies shall ever exist on the earth—the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman, either in its ancient form, in which case it has been destroyed; or in its ten horns, that yet exist, until they shall have filled up the measure of their wickedness. It is distinctly declared, that these vast systems of power shall come to an end; that the alliance of church and state—the union of the two beasts under Constantine the Great, has been the prolific cause of the evil and darkness that have settled on the church; and that the days of her millennial glory will probably not arrive until that unholy alliance shall be broken; and the call shall go forth to summon the fowls of the air, and the beasts of the field, to feast on the flesh and blood of kings, and nobles, and great men, and captains; or, in other words, until these systems of lordly and arrogant assumption have come to a bloody and untimely end. Would the downfall of these systems of government be predicted if they were regarded as blessings? Does this prediction indicate nothing concerning the estimate set by the Bible on systems like those which oppose republicanism?

But suppose, in addition to all this, that God were distinctly to reveal his will on the subject of government, and give a nation some form of polity, would not this be the highest possible evidence of his approbation of that form? If he had imbodied that form in the Bible, could we ask any further proof of this point? Even this we can furnish. God did give to a nation a form of government, and what was its nature, so far as men had the conducting of it? It was a republic. The Hebrew commonwealth, though a theocracy in its relation to God, was, in its relations to man, nothing more or less than a confederated republic, very similar to that of the United States. The tribes had each a separate and independent government, and possessed well-defined state rights. Over the whole was a general government, exercising distinct jurisdiction, and composed of four elements. These were the oracle, to which there is nothing corresponding in the United States government, as it is not a theocracy: the chief magistrate, or judge, corresponding with the president, and, like him, not a hereditary, but an elected, officer: the senate or sanhedrim of elders, answering to the federal senate; and the congregation of Israel, or the national diet, which, in its popular, representative character, resembled the house of representatives. The people possessed all the original power of government, and exercised it,

as to some governmental acts, more directly and primarily than can be done under the constitution and laws of the United States. But to balance this popular element, there existed the tribe of Levi, which acted as a check, or great balance-wheel, in the system, analogous to our judiciary. It would be interesting, if space permitted, to trace the various elements of this ancient republic, which existed when Rome and Athens were the abode of the wild beasts of the forest, and imbodied, for the first time in the world's history, the rights of the people, and gave to the human race that perfect and beautiful model of a republic which was afterward to be realized in a far distant land, over the blue waves of the ocean. It is sufficient to say, that it was a state without a nobility, without an aristocracy, and without a king; and that Moses imbodied the most liberal theory of the rights of man, in a practical form, before the world had learned to lisp the names of Lycurgus, Solon, or Numa. And when, afterward, the people servilely desired a king, the memorable language of God by Hosea is, "I gave them a king in my wrath;" a declaration mournfully confirmed by the history of the two monarchies, in both of which the kings, with few exceptions, were most bitter national curses.

We shall not enter upon the constitution of the New-Testament church, lest we be drawn away into irrelevant discussion on ecclesiastical polity. It is sufficient to our purpose to allude to the fact, that the advocates of all the prominent views taken of the proper constitution of the church are able to detect, in the particular theory they maintain, a strongly republican element.

Looking, then, at the language of prophecy, the form of the Hebrew commonwealth, the structure and doctrines of the New-Testament church, we are warranted to conclude that the influence of the Bible is essentially republican.

Our last appeal in this subject will be to the testimony of facts. In making this appeal, we are met by a difficulty arising from the nature of the subject. If the annals of the world were written on earth as they are written in heaven, the history of the world would be the history of the Bible, developing either its necessity, its rejection, or its influence. Yet in that history, as it is usually written, the Bible plays but a subordinate part. History is generally but the details of the bloodshed and turmoil of wicked and ambitious men; the pageantry of battles, and conquests, and garments rolled in blood; the intrigues of camps, and courts, and cabinets; the overthrow of one dynasty, and the establishment of another. Yet these are but the exponents of the world's history, not that history itself. They are but the cork, and straws, and

bubbles, on the surface of the stream, that indicate the deep whirlings of the eddies below. It is in these internal movements of society—in the deep pulsations of its mighty heart—that its real history lies. It is in the secret workings of great principles that are sometimes ages in their evolution and development in masses of mind, and in the gradual advancement of the universal mind, and the universal heart, that the true and proper history of the world is found. All else is but the movement of the index on the dial-plate, not the working of the mighty machinery within. Yet it is in these internal depths of society that we must seek the influence of the Bible. Not in the noise of the camp, the glare of the court, or the cabals of the cabinet, must we seek it; but in the lone cottage; in the sheltered hamlet; in the fireside words of gray-haired sires and meek-eyed matrons; in the morning and evening song of praise and low-breathed words of prayer; in the village school-room and the beaten play-ground; in the still depths of society, whose ocean-like heavings shake down thrones and cabinets like the froth that crests the wave; in the yet deeper depths of the human heart, from whose hidden fountains well forth, as from a thousand rills, the springs that swell the tide of human affairs; and in the silent workings of the religious principle that has always been the mightiest spring of action in the human heart. It is in these, and ten thousand other sources known only to the all-seeing eye, that we are to find at once the history of the world and the history of the Bible. But in spite of this difficulty, we have facts sufficiently palpable to be decisive of the question.

When Christianity entered the world, it found no middle class in any government. The people were divided into the governors and the governed; and they who were not fitted by wealth, family, or intellect, to be of the one, were ranked among the other. Even the Grecian and Roman republics, with all their boasted freedom, and in their best estate, were but overgrown, mammoth aristocracies, where for one freeman there were twenty, and, in some cases, forty or fifty slaves. In none of these republics were political rights extended to the mass of the people. Dark, crushing, and hopeless oppression was the lot of the poor man's life, and the legacy of the poor man's child. But soon, to the weary and weeping eyes of sorrowful watchers, there arose a star in the east, calm and beautiful as the last blush of even, but bright and powerful as the morning in its glory. The star, that hung in its high and mystic beauty above the manger of Bethlehem, was a herald of hope

to an oppressed as well as a guilty world. And when that august, but lowly, messenger appeared, for whom the world had been sighing, he opened the pages of inspiration, and proclaimed, as his high commission, "The Lord hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, to proclaim deliverance to the captive, the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound;" and the result was, that "the common people heard him gladly." These strange and wondrous words that fell from his lips, instinct with a life unknown to the frigid homilies of the Pharisee, and an authority unattainable to the pettifogging casuistry of the scribe, were drunk in eagerly by the listening thousands. Their echoes were borne on the wings of the wind to the darkest and furthest recesses of society. The hind at the plough was roused by the pealing accents; and, as he wiped the perspiration from his throbbing brow, he felt his soul swell with the waking consciousness that he too was a man, equally with the pampered lordling who fattened on his toil. The dusty artisan, as he measured his brawny arm and powerful frame with the effeminate and puny striplings who had usurped his rights, began, Samson like, to awake to a sense of his powers, and to feel the pillars of the house of his bondage. Even the chained galley slave paused on his oar, and, as he bent forward to catch the thrilling accents of these glorious truths, heard, like the roar of the shivering icebergs, the uprooting and crashing of the ancient and deep-laid prejudices of society; heard that he too might become "the Lord's free man," and sit side by side with his master. Wherever this word of glad tidings was brought, the poor man felt the weight cast off that long had pressed him to the earth, and walked forth in the conscious dignity of one of the kings and priests of the most high God. No sooner did that gigantic despot, that sat enthroned in grim and solitary majesty over a prostrate world, discover the tendency of these doctrines, than all the might of her terrible power was summoned to crush them. But Rome had forgotten, or rather, in her apotheosis of mere physical force, had never learned that

> "Truth crush'd to earth shall rise again,
> The eternal years of God are hers;
> But error wounded writhes in pain,
> And dies among her worshipers;"

and that

> "Freedom's battles once begun,
> Descend from bleeding sire to son,
> Though often lost, are surely won."

And although these battles seemed most unequal contests, on the one side being seen only the weak things of the world, while on the other were ranked its mighty, yet the result was speedily evinced. The battle-ax of Mars was made to fall before the spear of Ithuriel; and the might of force was made to yield to the might of truth. Rome, in casting herself into the arms of the church, made one great advance in the progress of popular emancipation, by affording free scope to the contact of Christian principles with the minds of the people, and recognizing the subordination of the throne to an organization imbodying, at least, some popular principles in its structure. It is true, this advance was apparently lost, when the tyranny of the priest took the place of the tyranny of the emperor. But this disappearance of these noble truths was only apparent, for they were still germinating in the dark. And even when most completely banished from the sight of men, they were still cherished and cradled in the hearts of a faithful few. In the sweet valleys of Piedmont, and in the green and sheltered vales that stretch in their quiet beauty between the towering peaks of the Alps and the Jura, these hallowed truths were nestled afar from the iron grasp of power, and the sweeping wave of barbarism and darkness that was deluging the world; awaiting the destined hour of glorious resurrection, when they should be transplanted in heroic faith and trial to the virgin soil of a world then hidden behind the blue waves of the ocean.

But even through that long night of darkness that brooded over the earth, the Bible was gradually, so far as its influence was felt, establishing the rights of the people. It gave birth to the canon law, at a time when there was no other law imbodying equally the principles of justice; and this has been the germ of much that is valuable in our modern jurisprudence. Hence the significance of a phrase, now unmeaning, "benefit of clergy;" for to be tried in an ecclesiastical court was to be tried by law; whereas to be tried in a civil court was to be subjected to ordeal by fire, by water, or by the sword. Many of the best principles of the common law—those principles that are the fountains of our rights—were drawn, not from the civil law, which was tyrannical to the last degree, but from the canon law, the system of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. We grant it to have been defective, but claim it as not only imbodying much if not most that was valuable in the Roman civil code, but as also the channel through which these principles became infused into English and American common law, and the fountain of many independent principles unknown to the civil law, and

drawn directly from the Bible. The ancient canon law was as far superior to the ancient civil law, as the modern common law is to the ancient canon.

It was also to the Bible that Europe owed much of the influence that caused the downfall of the feudal system. We pass by the crusades, whose agency in the overthrow of this system is familiar to every student of history, because they might not be regarded as a legitimate result of the principles of the Bible. Yet still it remains true, that it was the belief of both baron and vassal in the records of Holy Writ that induced them to adopt those measures which issued in the gradual removal of this ancient system of tenure and relation. It was the Bible and the church that established, or rather constituted, at least one element which was of vast importance in European civilization, and which acted as an antagonism to the baronial and royal power. This element manifested itself in a variety of forms. Most of the charters of manumission granted to serfs before the time of Louis X. are declared expressly to be *pro amore Dei*, or *pro redemptione et salute animæ*. Thus, in the steady resistance always offered by the church to slavery, by her proclamation of the natural equality of man, in the stimulant held up to industry and merit in her dignities, and in a thousand other forms, she was gradually developing the free elements of modern society.

When we come to the time of the Reformation, our argument merges into that by which we endeavored to sustain the proposition, that the Reformation of the sixteenth century was the origin of American liberty; and we can only refer to that discussion as carrying forward, in the main, our argument on the present point down to our own age.

Without, then, entering into further or more specific detail, we ask, When and where has liberty most vigorously flourished? Has it not been whenever and wherever the Bible was most generally known, and most purely loved? And where now do the people enjoy their rights most fully? Where are the rights of person and property most freely recognized and most carefully guarded? Is it in pagan China, Mohammedan Turkey, or semi-Christian Russia? Is it not in Christian Britain and America? And do not the nations of Christian Europe enjoy liberty precisely in proportion as they enjoy the Bible? Is there a single nation that has permanently enjoyed a free constitution without the Bible? And has there ever been a nation which enjoyed the free use of the word of God, which did not also enjoy freedom? Why are these things true? How can they be rightly explained on any other hypothesis,

than that for which we contend, that the tendency of the Bible is republican?

There are obvious applications of this proposition to great controversies at present waging in our land, reproving the extremes of the several antagonisms of opinion, and showing that in them, as in most angry disputes, "*in medio tutissimus ibis.*" But these applications we forbear, and hasten to a close.

In view of the argument to which we have attended, we ask, Is not this Bible to us at once a most priceless and most perilous trust? Priceless in its use, and perilous in its neglect? America with the Bible, the banded world cannot crush; America without it, the world cannot save. With it we have a wall of fire and a munition of rocks: without it we cast away the shield of protection, cut loose the sheet-anchor of safety, and in that fearful time of commotion soon to come on the earth, the first rushing of whose stormy pinions we can already hear in the distance; when there shall "be signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars, on the earth distress of nations and perplexity, the sea and the waves roaring, men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after the things that are coming on the earth;" when every island, and sea, and mountain, shall flee from the presence of the Lamb, and the waves of this mighty flood-tide of the world shall dash against every institution, then this proud but rotten fabric of liberty, built as it would be on the shifting sands, must fall with a crash that shall startle the world. But if we cherish it and rest on it, it will be a girdle of adamant around our glorious Union; a fortress of defense against every foe; a living principle, by whose vital energy our nation shall advance rapidly and surely to the glittering point of greatness and power before it. Our children's children shall come and sit down beneath its hallowed protection; the footsteps of youth shall be stayed; the energy of manhood directed; the tears of sorrow dried; the weakness and decrepitude of age strengthened; and when life's great task is done, the linked succession of faithful witnesses for God and truth, for religion and liberty, shall all be gathered to where "the wicked shall cease from troubling, and the weary be at rest."

ART. IV.—*The Sufferings of Christ.* By a Layman. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1845.

Is there anything, inquires the Preacher, whereof it may be said, See, this is new? The question supposes a negative answer; and with reference to the dogma discussed in the volume before us, and a great majority of the arguments by which it is sustained, those who are acquainted with the early history of the church will agree with us in the opinion, that "it hath been already of old time which was before us."

That dogma is, in the author's own language, "That the expiatory agonies of our Lord reached not only his humanity, but his very Godhead;" and that "to *suffer* and to *die* was the object for which the *living God* became the incarnate Captain of our salvation."

We say this heresy has not the piquancy of novelty. So early as the second century after Christ, the distinction of persons in the Holy Trinity was denied; and a sect, not indeed numerous, nor yet destitute of learning, were called *Patripassians*, because they maintained that the great God, the Father of the universe, suffered, and agonized, and bled, and died, in the person of Jesus the Nazarene. In the third century Noetus of Smyrna avowed and advocated the same doctrine; contending that the supreme Being expiated the sins of men in his own proper person. Apollinaris, who was raised to the see of Laodicea in the fourth century, in his contest with Arius, ran into precisely the same doctrine as that now put forth in the volume before us, with the pompous pretensions of being some new thing. Like our author, the Laodicean bishop seems to have thought it an important and impregnable position, whence only it was possible successfully to assail his Unitarian opponents.

In opposition to this theory, which had been gaining proselytes during the second, third, and part of the fourth centuries, and to its utter demolition, Athanasius, the celebrated patriarch of Alexandria, put forth an elaborate argument, which is still extant; and which, down to the days of "a Layman," has been considered as settling the question. Hence, what appears so strange to our author, namely, that the pulpit has been almost silent on this theme, and that he has searched in vain for arguments in modern theological treatises, is readily accounted for. The question was settled, and needed not discussion: a very different thing, we may say with

our author's permission, from its being incapable of discussion, or unsusceptible of proof.

Let us not be understood as questioning the piety or the sincerity of our author. He has begun to search the Scriptures; and writes, apparently, with the conviction of having truth on his side. Bating his love for the grandiloquent, which occasionally drives him into bombast, and a misplaced floridity of style, the book speaks creditably for his scholarship.

In his first chapter he announces his belief in the doctrine of the *trinity;* and it is to his pressing this doctrine beyond Scriptural warrant, even so far as to overlook and keep out of sight the essential *unity* of the Godhead, that the originating idea of the theory, so far as our author is concerned, may be traced. Thus he says:—

"If St. Paul, when caught up into the third heaven, was permitted to gaze, with adoring and melting eyes, on the glory and benignity of the Highest, his rapt vision was neither divided nor distracted by seeing, on the right-hand seat of the celestial throne, that Saviour who had died to redeem him, and, on the left-hand seat, that Holy Spirit who had regenerated, sanctified, and imbued with the balm of comfort, his persecuted and earth-wounded soul."—P. 15.

That, we suppose, is meant for fine writing. Earth-wounded soul *is* pretty. Right-hand seat and left-hand seat are striking images; but we want something more from a teacher of theology than his mere assertion that Paul saw any such thing. The apostle does not intimate the least foundation for so glaring an absurdity. But further:—

"In that temple of the highest heavens, consecrated as the abode of the Godhead, each of its divine persons enjoys blissful and untiring communion with *his two other glorious selves*."—P. 17.

And again:—

"What desolation would pervade the courts of heaven, reaching even to the sanctuary of Him that sitteth upon the throne, could a ruthless arm of flesh pluck from his right hand and his left the beloved *fellows* of his eternal reign!"—P. 18.

Thus we see our author is sound upon the doctrine of a trinity of persons in the Godhead; and equally clear, if that left-hand idea do not imply inferiority, in his assertion of their essential co-equality. He entirely forgets, however, and for the sake of his argument it is necessary he should, that fundamental truth—these three are one. Hence, in this same chapter, in an attempt to answer

the Socinian argument, that a plurality of persons tends to divide and distract devotional love and worship, he talks on this wise:—

"Had this distinguished man, [he alludes to Channing, the Unitarian,] with feelings so true to nature, forgotten the blissful days of youth, when his gladsome eyes beheld, and his bounding heart leaped forth to greet, at the domestic altar, two distinct, yet united personages, who both claimed and received his undivided and undiminished reverence, and gratitude, and love? Was his filial piety distracted by the plurality of its objects? Did his heart yield a less true and fervent homage to his father, because the angel form of his mother was hovering around him, arrayed in the lovely habiliments of her own meekness, and gentleness, and grace? Did he find it needful, for the full concentration and development of filial devotion, that one of his parents should be for ever banished from the domestic hearth, leaving the other in cheerless solitude?"—P. 14.

Here we have, evidently, the starting-point of our author's vagaries. In the "two distinct yet united personages," whom we call father and mother, he professes to see a similitude and a type of the union subsisting between two of the persons in the Godhead. The idea is monstrous, and the analogy most preposterous. We blush for the thought which here occurs to us, but we must say, that upon the hypothesis of our author, he might with as much propriety introduce Channing's grandmother, as making a *trio* at the domestic altar; and "claiming and receiving"—inasmuch as to her he was indebted for at least one of his parents—his "undivided and undiminished reverence, and gratitude, and love." Would not "a Layman" himself see the absurdity of his analogy, if he had pushed it thus far? Probably; and, if his eye falls upon this page, he will be angry with us for carrying out his dual idea, and making it illustrate his fundamentally erroneous conception of a trinity in unity. The most strenuous Socinian could have no very strong objection to the admission of such a union between the persons of the Godhead, as exists between the united head of an earth-born family. True, in a certain sense the husband and the wife are one; and what God hath joined together, Christ himself hath said, let no man put asunder. But in what sense are they one? Is it a union implying absolute equality? No; for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and wives are commanded to be in subjection to their husbands, and to submit themselves unto them as unto the Lord. Nor is it such a union that the attributes of one may be predicated of the other. Timidity, gentleness, grace, belong to the female; the male may be equally characterized by boldness, impetuosity, sternness. By

sympathy the one may, indeed, be a sharer in the joys and in the sorrows of the other; and what is done by the wife, for instance, in the absence of the husband, may, or may not, be ratified by him. But all this is far from being even a faint adumbration of the eternal unity of the Godhead. The Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, are one in an essential equality, one in all their attributes, one in such a sense, that what is affirmed of the Father, may with equal propriety be affirmed of the Son; and what is done by the second person in the Trinity, may, with equal truth, be attributed to the first, or third. The creation of the world, which Moses assigns to GOD, is, by John, declared to have been by the *Word*. The church, which Paul declares to have been so loved by *Christ* that he gave *himself* for it, is by the same apostle called the "church of GOD, which he purchased with *his own blood*." Peter asserts that he, whose heart Satan filled to lie to the *Holy Ghost*, had lied unto GOD; and while the Baptist declares that no man hath seen God at any time, and the apostle to the Gentiles speaks of that "blessed and only Potentate whom no man hath seen nor *can* see," Jesus Christ assures his disciples, without qualification or restriction,—"He that hath seen *me*, hath seen the *Father*."

This point being established, and we presume it needs not further argument or stronger evidence, our author's theory is reduced, unwittingly on his part, doubtless, to this absurdity: the truth of his proposition, that the expiatory agonies of our Lord reached not only his humanity, but his very Godhead, being admitted, it follows, that when Christ suffered, and was in agony, and expired, the Father and the Holy Spirit also suffered, and agonized, and died. We say this absurdity follows, if the three who bare record in heaven are one, and IF the position of our author be admitted; but this is alike revolting to our feelings and repugnant to the Scriptures, and hence the doctrine of "a Layman" cannot by any possibility be true. Which horn of the dilemma, the reader may ask, does our author choose? Does he crucify the Father and the Spirit; or does he run into tritheism, and deny the fundamental truth—there is *one* God? We may not answer that question. Courtesy to a tyro in religious authorship, and charity to a well-meant attempt to set the Christian world right, both forbid us to charge upon him consequences which he did not foresee, resulting in doctrines which he would assuredly disavow. It is, however, evident that during the whole course of the author's reasoning he appears to forget, to lose sight of, or to overlook, the essential and eternal unity of the sacred three; and when pressed with a difficulty like that we have here presented, as in his attempted confu-

tation of Bishop Pearson, he scorns not to seek refuge behind a logical subtilty.

So again, when, at what he calls "the very threshold of his argument," he is met by the objection, God cannot suffer—which, to our minds, has always been tantamount to the truism, God is God—he asks:—

"Upon what authority do its adherents apply their standing axiom—'God is impassible'—to the suffering of one of the persons of the Trinity, emanating from his own free volition and sovereign choice? They hold the affirmative of their hypothesis. The rules of evidence, matured and sanctioned by the wisdom of ages, devolve on them the burden of proof. To the living alone can we appeal; and from them we solemnly invoke the proof of an hypothesis gratuitously advanced, and which commingles itself with the vital elements of Christian faith."—P. 25.

This is very true: "the rules of evidence, matured and sanctioned by the wisdom of ages," do throw upon the affirmant of any question the burden of proof. But whose is the affirmative in this matter? It requires little ingenuity, by the addition or omission of a negative particle, to make the disputants on almost any question change places. Thus, in the case before us; "the Deity is impassible," may be called, by one emulous of victory rather than anxious for truth, an affirmative proposition; but a moment's reflection would have satisfied him that it is nothing more and nothing less than the negative of his own corner-stone position—the divine Being *is* capable of enduring pain and suffering in his own essential divinity. Our author's challenge, therefore, to his imaginary opponents may be retorted upon himself; and with far greater logical propriety may he be called upon to produce, from the Bible, "a passage which intimates directly, or indirectly, that one of the persons of the Trinity *has* physical and moral ability to suffer." We have, however, no time to waste, and no space to spare for such trifling upon so grave a subject. Let us look at his arguments. And first, Jehovah being omnipotent, could, if he pleased, suffer. This we suppose to be a fair interpretation, and, indeed, the plain English of the charge brought by our author against those who differ from him, when he says, they "hamper Omnipotence by fetters made in the forges of earth;" or when, as in the following passage, he waxes eloquent:—

"Would reasoning pride scale the highest heavens, and, standing at the entrance of the divine pavilion, proclaim, in the hearing of astonished cherubim and seraphim, that Omnipotence lacks physical or

moral ability to become the willing recipient of suffering, prompted by its own ineffable love, and sanctioned by its own unerring wisdom?" —P. 27.

And again he asks:—"Would not such an incapacity to suffer imply imperfection and infirmity in the divine nature?"

It becomes us, with lowly reverence, in looking at the question, —What can the Almighty, and what can he not do? to remember that we are but dust; and that while the things which are revealed belong to us and to our children, the secret things belong to God. They belong to him in such a sense that no created being can find them out, or wrest them from him. Hence, whatever may be the pretensions of those who would be wise above what is written, when, in speaking of the Holy One, they pass one step beyond what is revealed, or clearly to be inferred from revelation, they do not assert what may, or may not, be true;—they have not merely entered into the regions of probability, but are bewildering themselves in the darkness of error and falsehood. Their conjectures and hypotheses must, from the nature of the case, be untrue. Else has man fathomed the unfathomable, and robbed God of his secrets; which, if our position be incorrect, are His no longer. From all creatures in all worlds to whom may be proposed the question of Zophar, Canst thou by searching find out God; canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? it must receive a negative answer. Let us keep, therefore, to the record; and, having seen how the theory of our author clashes with the divine unity, turn we our thoughts to other attributes which have been clearly revealed.

Throughout the entire texture of God's revelation, the fact that he is perfectly happy is everywhere inwoven. A familiarity with the Bible precludes the supposition that he can be otherwise for a moment. It results from his inherent, and, we may say it reverently, his necessitated goodness. He is God over all blessed for evermore. So essential is this point even to our conceptions of the Deity, that when to him are attributed those feelings and emotions which among men mar the perfection of happiness, such as jealousy, grief, vexation, anger, we are obliged to attach to them a very different meaning from what the words imply when spoken of frail and erring humanity. Nor is there any difficulty here. What are with us agitating emotions, are with Him fixed principles. God is love, and everything predicated of the divine Being must of necessity harmonize with that glorious declaration. But it is widely different with suffering, which always, even in the opinion of our author, implies pain; and pain can mean nothing less, in the vocabulary of men or angels, than a diminution of hap-

piness. Now that CHRIST suffered is beyond dispute. His whole life from the cradle to the cross was one scene of suffering. If, therefore, those "agonies," to quote the language of the volume before us, "reached his very Godhead," he must have been during the three and thirty years of his incarnation less than perfectly happy, by the gross amount of the suffering, the pain, the agony endured. In order to sustain the theory of "a Layman," it becomes necessary, therefore, absurd as is the idea, to subtract this season of suffering from the "for evermore," which the sure word of prophecy applies to the blessedness of him, whom it styles the *happy* God, τῦ μακαρίυ Θεῦ, 1 Tim. i, 11, &c.

The immutability of the divine Being conducts to the same result. With HIM is no variableness nor shadow of turning. His own declaration is:—"I am the Lord, I change not." The alteration of his feelings and his conduct toward the man, who, yesterday a rebel in arms, a sinner in the way to hell, is to-day a subdued, rejoicing penitent, implies no change in HIM. The *character* he once loved he always loves; and sin is everywhere and always the abominable thing which his soul hateth. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Of this there can be no doubt; and it follows conclusively and irresistibly, either that the divine Being has never known suffering, or he has always been a sufferer.

In opposition to these arguments from the happiness and immutability of God, our author asserts, first, that the Scriptural passages in which "blessedness" is ascribed to the Deity are "rather ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving than averments of his infinite beatitude." In proof of which position he cites the paraphrase of Macknight, who, it seems, thus renders one passage in which eternal blessedness is attributed to the Creator: "Worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is to be *praised* for ever." Feeling, however, that this was an untenable position, and of no consequence even were it sound, seeing that Scripture affirmations are not needed to demonstrate the happiness of God, our author, in the second place, puts forth this argument:—

> "If the ascriptions implied declarations of unchanged beatitude, and reached the past as well as the coming eternity, then Christ suffered not. His passion was but oriental imagery."—P. 259.

A very thin veil, we know, suffices frequently to conceal the absurdity of an argument from him who advances it in support of a darling theory; but this is so thin that we can scarcely persuade ourselves that "a Layman" did not see through it. We will venture the assertion, that of no two things has our author himself more

absolute certainty than of the unchangeable beatitude of God, and the sufferings of Christ: God is for ever happy, Christ did suffer. What follows? That his passion was but oriental imagery? No; but that his sufferings reached not the Godhead, and that the entire theory of the volume before us crumbles into dust, by the fair evolution of the arguments adduced to sustain it.

Still stranger assertions are made:—

"A Being of infinite power, knowledge, wisdom, holiness, justice, and goodness, has within himself infinite resources of felicity. But the felicity of the Deity is subject to his volition. He is not fated to the same unchangeable condition of blessedness whether he wills it or not. His beatitude is, like his glory, rather the emanation of his combined attributes than a distinct attribute of itself."—P. 260.

Something like this is, indeed, to be found in the pages of a learned commentator, with reference to the foreknowledge of God. In an attempt to reconcile that attribute with man's free agency, he hazards the position that the Omniscient is not obliged to know all things, but that there may be many things of which he chooses to be ignorant. The absurdity was too glaring to gain many proselytes. The proof of both doctrines—the perfect knowledge of God and the perfect freedom of man—is ample, and amounts to demonstration; while the connecting link, by which they are united and made to harmonize, is, and will perhaps for ever be, among the secret things which belong to Him. Our author's idea has, so far as we know, the merit of novelty; and the very fact of his being driven to take the position that "the felicity of the Deity is subject to his volition," ought to have warned him from the dangerous ground upon which he had been lured by the *ignis fatuus* of ambitious authorship. But he allows himself to be led still further into the thicket:—

"We believe that the beatitude of the Deity is progressive. Progression seems to be a governing principle, pervading the intellectual universe. Its display in man is palpable. Doubtless, it pervades the angelic hosts. Why should it not reach the beatitude of Him who made progressive man in his own image and after his own likeness?—Who will venture to presume that this enhancement of blessedness (happiness) ascends not even to those who fill the celestial throne?"—P. 262.

We have before adverted to the looseness of our author's language with reference to the divine unity, and need not dwell upon the unscriptural language which speaks of "*those* who fill the celestial throne;" but simply say, in opposition to the inferential argument, that because men and angels are progressive, therefore

"the beatitude of the Deity is progressive," that it is alike repugnant to Scripture and to common sense. Progression in knowledge, wisdom, happiness, implies necessarily and always imperfection, or at least something short of absolute perfection, and to assert this of the supreme Being is little less than blasphemy. But to pursue this train of thought only one step further, we remark, that suffering of any kind, and for any length of time, is absolutely incompatible with the *perfection* of God. "Your Father in heaven is perfect," was the declaration of the incarnate Word; and, though "it became him [the Word] for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings," yet is it a self-evident proposition that *suffering* is not *essential* to the perfection of Deity; and consequently, the Captain of our salvation did not suffer in his divine nature. Indeed, the passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews, just quoted, teaches this truth with great clearness. A broad distinction is there made between the WORD, "by whom are all things," and the Captain of our salvation, who was made "perfect through sufferings:" a distinction, which, if it had not been overlooked by our author, or willfully kept in the background, he had not thus attempted to mar the infinite *perfection* of Jehovah,—the crowning glory of the great I AM.

Now, although it be true, in the language of our author, that "from Genesis to Revelation, both inclusive, there is not a passage which intimates, *directly*, that one of the persons of the Trinity has not physical and moral ability to suffer," we think that indirectly, at least, and by legitimate inference, we have made it clear that the divine nature is incapable of suffering. Our author's question, therefore, "Would not an incapacity to suffer imply imperfection in the divine nature?" is answered unhesitatingly in the negative. No imperfection can be attributed to any being on account of inability to do what is contrary to its nature. It is written, Titus i, 2, that He who "promised eternal life *cannot* lie." Jesus said, Matt. xix, 26, "With God all things are possible:" yet it is written, Heb. vi, 18, It is "impossible for God to lie." So again it is said, 2 Tim. ii, 13, "He *cannot* deny himself." St. James tells us,—and this has a direct bearing on the question at issue, inasmuch as the temptations of the Redeemer constituted a part of his sufferings,—"God *cannot* be tempted," chap. i, 17. Do these inabilities imply imperfection? Far from it. They result, on the contrary, from the very nature, if we may use that word, of Him who is unchangeably perfect in all his attributes. With as much propriety, we might predicate infirmity of the divine Being, because he fainteth not,

neither is weary; and because he cannot cease to exist,—as to attribute to him imperfection, because physically and morally he is incapable of suffering.

Thus much for what our author calls the hypothesis of God's impassibility to voluntary sufferings; and of which he says:—

"It is not a self-evident proposition. It carries not demonstration on its face; it proves not itself; it requires extraneous confirmation. From whence is such confirmation to be derived? It is yielded neither by the Bible nor by the deliberative process of sound reasoning."—P. 34.

After a page or two more of similar declamation, he asks:—

"Will not plenary proof from Scripture, that the divine nature of Christ actually participated in his mediatorial sufferings, convince even reasoning skepticism that the divinity had physical and moral capacity to suffer?"—P. 44.

Of course we cannot answer that question. "Reasoning skepticism" is not easily convinced of anything; yet will we freely admit that when "plenary proof from Scripture" is adduced, that the divine nature *did actually suffer*, it will be very *un*reasonable in "reasoning skepticism" not to admit that the divine nature *had the capacity* of suffering. We say nothing of the modesty which applies the epithet just quoted to the great and the good of every age; who, bringing to bear upon the question learning, and candor, and piety, have settled it to the satisfaction of the universal church; but, possessing our soul in as much patience as we may, we shall look at the "plenary proof from Scripture," in the order in which it is presented for our consideration.

After transcribing a great many passages from the New Testament which affirm that Christ suffered, and solemnly reminding those who may presume to differ from him, of the awful penalties denounced against the man who adds unto, or takes away from, the words of the Book of God, our author says:—

"If the Scriptural passages declarative of the sufferings of Christ are taken in their plain, obvious, and ordinary sense, they include, beyond peradventure, his divine nature as well as his humanity. The name of Christ is used by inspired writers to indicate the length, and breadth, and height, and depth of his sufferings; and that name, in its ordinary import, has no limits narrower than the whole compass of his united natures."—P. 66.

It is scarcely possible that our author did not see that he is here begging the entire question. That question is,—Do the Scriptural passages, which speak of the sufferings of the Redeemer, include his divinity as well as his humanity? Our author assumes that

they do; and then gravely gives us this assumption as an argument to prove that those sufferings reached not only his humanity, but his very Godhead. In the elucidation of his argument, however, he is constrained to admit that there are instances to be found in Scripture, "where words expressive of Christ" can be applied only to his human nature; and where the name of Christ *has* "limits narrower than the whole compass of his united natures." But these, he tells us, are "insulated" cases; and in them, "the limitation to his humanity is rendered inevitable by intrinsic marks on the passages themselves." In his most profound research he has found two such passages. The one John xiv, 28, "My Father is greater than I:" the other Matt. xxiv, 36, "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only."

Now, while there can be no doubt of the fact, that in the name Christ are included both his human and his divine natures, it is equally clear, as we proceed to show, that the cases wherein his humanity only must have been intended are neither few nor "insulated." Of whom, we ask, does the evangelist speak, when he says:—"Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man?" Luke ii, 52. The answer is,—Of the "Lord's Christ," of whom we are told, in a preceding verse, that it had been revealed unto Simeon that he should not die without the sight. But such language most assuredly cannot refer to his divinity. As God, he certainly did not increase in wisdom, nor in stature; least of all in favor with God. We read also (John iv, 6) of his "being wearied with his journey;" yet no one would have attributed this weariness to the divine Being, even if it had not been written:—"The LORD fainteth not, neither is weary." Isa. xl, 28. We cannot persuade ourselves that it is necessary to dilate upon these illustrations. He who endured hunger (Matt. iv, 2, and xxi, 18) and thirst, (John iv, 7, and xix, 28,) who fasted, and marveled, and prayed, and wept; who groaned in spirit and was troubled, whose *soul* was exceeding sorrowful, who exclaimed, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" was, indeed, the Saviour of the world,—Jesus, the Christ: but in all these instances, and they might be multiplied, it is beyond a peradventure that reference is made solely to his human nature. Hence, the assertion of our author, that "the name Christ, in its ordinary import, has no limits narrower than the whole compass of his united natures," is shown to be unfounded and untrue. Our author continues:—

"Would the inspired writers, would our Lord himself, if intending to have it believed that the divinity of Christ had not suffered, have used, to express the sufferings of his mere terrestrial adjunct, terms

applicable to the whole infinitude of his united natures; and terms, too, which are crippled and distorted by a more limited application? They best knew the natures and agonies of the Mediator; and when they used the significant term, the Christ, to designate the recipient of the expiatory sufferings, they must have meant that the Christ, the whole Christ of the Bible, had suffered."—Pp. 69, 70.

There is something inexpressibly revolting in the language here used. By the *mere terrestrial adjunct* our author is pleased to designate that body, of which, "when He cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a BODY hast THOU prepared me." "By the which will," it is added, "we are sanctified *through the offering of* THE BODY *of Jesus Christ*, once for all." Heb. x, 5, 10. A *mere* terrestrial adjunct!—But then, if the inspired writers and our Lord himself intended to have it believed that the divinity of Christ did not suffer, they have crippled and distorted the plain meaning of the terms used by them. This is the argument stripped of its redundant verbiage. Now we shall prove that the sacred writers do attribute a large portion of the sufferings of the Redeemer to the man Christ Jesus; that they were sufferings in which the divine nature *could not* participate; and we shall leave our author to settle, to his own satisfaction, the charge of "crippling and distorting language." "He that reproveth God, let *him* answer it."

We refer, then, to the *temptations* of our Lord; and we do this the rather, because, in every step of the argument, we are fortified by the express and positive declarations of Holy Writ. By the evangelists we are informed, that being full of the Holy Ghost, he was forty days tempted of the devil; and the apostle intimates that this was by no means the whole amount of his trials from this source; for he assures us, (Heb. iv, 15,) that our great High Priest, *Jesus, the Son of God*, "was in *all points tempted* like as we are;" and ye, said the Saviour himself to his disciples, "Ye are they which have continued with me *in my temptations*." Luke xxii, 28. He does not, of course, allude to the scene in the wilderness, where he grappled, alone, with the prince of darkness; but refers, evidently, to the whole period of his sojourn with those whom he had selected as his immediate followers, and during which, he was, in all points, tempted as we are tempted. The apostle settles the question, too, which might otherwise here be asked, and perhaps, by our author, be boldly answered in the negative:—Did these temptations constitute a part of the *sufferings* of our Lord?—"HE himself hath SUFFERED, being *tempted*." Heb. ii, 18. There yet remains, for the completion of this branch of the argument, the

question to which, with any other antagonist, we should not deem it necessary to allude:—Might not these sufferings from temptation have reached the very Godhead of Christ? That is answered by the apostle James, in a passage to which we have once before referred,—"God *cannot* be tempted with evil."

The next position of our author which requires a passing notice is in the following words:—

"Had there been any distinction between the two natures of Christ in the essential, the paramount article of suffering, it was not only to be expected, but it was important that the inspired writers should have pointed it out. It would have been one of the land-marks of Christian faith, not to be left afloat at the mercy of opinion. The inspired writers had been well-schooled in the doctrines taught by the Holy Ghost, and were fully competent to expound them with simplicity and precision." —P. 112.

And again:—

"Had there existed a distinction between his two natures in the grand article of suffering, the philosophic, the logical, the lucid, the discriminating Paul would not have failed to indicate it somewhere in his voluminous writings, even if omitted by the less-extended authors of the New Testament. It is not intimated by any of the inspired writers, because it was not intimated to any of them by the Holy Ghost."—P. 114.

This is really, so far as our memory now serves us, the most astounding assertion that we have ever met with in any professedly orthodox Christian author, when writing upon a doctrine of our holy religion. "It is not intimated by any of the inspired writers, that there existed a distinction between the two natures of Christ in the grand article of suffering!" With as much truth the latter clause of the sentence might have been omitted; for, if the sacred writers do not intimate a distinction between the two natures of Christ in the article of suffering, they do not intimate such a distinction in anything; and the old Monophysite heresy, of one person and one nature mysteriously confounded, is chargeable upon the apostles; nay, upon the Holy Ghost; for *they* do not intimate such a distinction, "*because* it was not intimated to them by the Holy Ghost."

In refutation of this bold assertion, we need not again advert to those sufferings of our blessed Lord which have been already noticed; and which, from the necessity of the case, must have been confined to his human nature. If the sufferings of hunger, and thirst, and weariness, if prayers, and fastings, and temptations, do not intimate proper humanity, as distinct from essential divinity,

in the person of the sufferer; then, indeed, is it impossible for language to express or "intimate" any such distinction; and it must follow, that no such distinction in reality exists. Consequently, it will follow, that the general church of Christ, with the exception of the Monophysites and the Theopaschites,* has lived, and moved, and had its being in one grand heresy.

But "the philosophic, the logical, the lucid, the discriminating Paul" has nowhere "indicated this distinction in his voluminous writings." Possibly he has not, with sufficient clearness to make him see who is determined to keep his eyes shut; and yet, two or three passages from his writings occur to us in which it requires no very strong vision to see an "intimation" of this distinction. Thus, in writing to the Hebrews, he says,—"Though he were a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered." Heb. v, 8. Of whom is he speaking? Of Christ, the only begotten of the Father, "a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." "He learned obedience by the things which He suffered." A passing strange jargon will this language make, if we supply the place of the pronouns used by Paul, in accordance with the theory of our author. The supreme Being learned obedience by the things which he (God) suffered! Again, in his second letter to the Corinthians, i, 5,—"The sufferings of Christ abound in *us*:" and to the Colossians, i, 24,—"I Paul, ... now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh," &c. Whatever may be the correct interpretation of these and similar passages, and it is not necessary here to enter into any lengthened comment upon them, they can mean nothing less than that, in the opinion of the great apostle, his own "sufferings" and "afflictions" were of *the same nature* as those of his great Master. If they were not, he could not have used this language. If they were, these sufferings reached not the divinity of our Lord. So, also, in all those passages in which Christians are said to be "*partakers*" of his sufferings, to be sufferers with Christ; and most especially where, as in 1 Peter ii, 21, Christ's suffering is held up as "an example" for us, "that *we* should follow *his* steps," is that distinction, which our author says the sacred writers do not even intimate, most clearly to be seen. And when seen, no further argument is needed to annihilate the doctrine, that those sufferings, which worms of the dust are exhorted to imitate, to partake of, to fill up, reached the very Godhead of our Lord.

* This word expresses the enormous error of those frantic doctors who imagined that the Godhead suffered in and with Christ.—*Mosheim.*

In fairness to our author we must observe here, that he does admit, that two passages in the Epistles of St. Peter *seem* to intimate a distinction, which he declares to be not founded upon the Scriptures, but "earth-born." The passages referred to are those in which Christ is said to have "suffered for us in the *flesh*;"—to have been "put to death in the *flesh*;" and, inasmuch, as they are "the only passages which Bishop Pearson, in his Exposition of the Apostles' Creed, has cited, as bearing directly on the subject, we are, doubtless, justified,"—says our author,—"in concluding that they were the only ones he could find." A palpable *non sequitur;* and if it were so, that Pearson could find no other passages bearing upon the subject, it does not follow that the passages are not there; nor even that our author himself could not have found them, if he had not been determined to sustain, at all hazards, an exploded dogma. To an examination of these passages from St. Peter are devoted several pages of what gentlemen of the law call special pleading, which we will not insult the common sense of our readers by transcribing. Our author then adds:—

"If this conclusion is correct, then the two passages from 1 Peter, invoked and marshaled *against us* [Pearson died some time before the 'Layman' wrote his book] by the modern representative of the prevalent theory, as competent of themselves to vanquish all opposition, are found in the day of trial, though forming his whole array, to leave the service into which they had been impressed, and passing over into our ranks, to form two of the chief supporters of our argument."—P. 120.

Io triumphe! "*if* this conclusion is correct." We marvel not that our author has some doubts about the correctness of his conclusion; but we really were not prepared for the request made to his readers at the close of this chapter. He started with the unqualified assertion, that a distinction between the two natures of Christ in the grand article of suffering is not even intimated by any of the sacred writers. He tapers gradually through the succeeding pages of the chapter until he reaches—a point; upon which, seeing it has neither length, breadth, nor thickness, he is constrained to ask the assistance of his opponents to enable him to stand. He says:—

"We close with a request to the reader that *he* will apply our remarks to kindred passages, which, *escaping our notice*, may occur to his; which, though seemingly confined to the outer man of Christ, and tending to limit his sufferings to his humanity, *may*, nevertheless, on a little examination, be found to comprehend his indwelling Godhead."—P. 123.

In succeeding chapters our author refers to a variety of passages, and dwells upon them at great length, in which humiliation, and suffering, and death are attributed to the *Word*, to the Son of God, to God himself. Among them are the following:—"When we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." Rom. v, 10. "Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because He laid down his life for us." 1 John iii, 16.* "The Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." Gal. ii, 20. "The church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts xx, 28. "Ye killed the Prince of life." Acts iii, 15. "Crucified the Lord of glory." 1 Cor. ii, 8.

With reference to the declarations contained in these passages, and in a multitude of others, similar in phraseology and in import, we have to say, in the first place:—We fully admit them to be a part of the divine record; and so far from giving any countenance to that ingenuity which seeks, by glosses, by far-fetched interpretations, by various and by doubtful readings, to nullify their force, or to dilute their strength, we glory in them. He who was crucified was the Lord of glory, and the Prince of life. God did purchase the church with his own blood; and he who walked the streets of Judea a houseless wanderer, who was reviled, and buffeted, and scourged, was God manifest in the flesh. Upon this great truth we stake all our hopes of immortality. We see in the world's Redeemer that perfect humanity which allies him to our race, and constitutes him our elder brother; and we see that supreme divinity which alone was capable of making an atonement for sin. Nor have we any respect for that squeamishness which seeks to propitiate the Socinian by affecting great nicety of language in speaking of the wondrous fact of a world's redemption. Nothing is to be gained by it, and it is at direct variance with the writings of the apostles. True, as we have seen, *argumentatively*, the sacred writers are cautious in making a distinction between the natures of that Being who was of the *seed of David*, according to the *flesh*, and the *Son of God*, according to the Spirit of holiness, but of whom they everywhere speak, as do his true disciples, always, in their prayers and in their hymns of praise, as of one undivided Lord.

There is then a true sense in which the sufferings of Christ, the shedding of his blood, his agony and death, were, indeed, divine. It is found in that hypostatic union of the two natures which is set

* In all fairness, our author ought to have stated,—he could not help knowing,—that the words, "of God," in this passage, are not found in the best manuscripts, and that our translators have printed them in italics.

forth with great precision in the second article of religion, as established by the Church of England, incorporated into our own, and found, we believe, in every orthodox creed: "Two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried." The Scriptures teach us to regard neither the humanity nor the divinity of the Redeemer apart and alone. The act of redemption required a kinsman of the race to be redeemed; its price, an equivalent for the glory to be purchased. In the rather stilted language of our author,—"Divine justice could not pardon mortal sin without satisfaction; the exchequer of heaven could receive payment in no coin save that of suffering." Not in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, the man of sorrows, nor in that of the Word, who was God; but in Him in whom the Godhead and manhood were inseparably joined—in Christ, very God and very man—could these conflicting claims be met and answered. The man could not redeem: the God could not suffer.

In confirmation of this view of the subject, let us reverently turn our attention to what may be considered emphatically *the* hour of his suffering. Let us go with our blessed Lord to the garden of Gethsemane. Let us again hear his cry:—"My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death;" and listen to that thrice-repeated prayer,—"My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." "The hour is come!" and "his sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground." Of whom is this spoken? We agree with our author, most assuredly not of the man Christ Jesus. "The emotions displayed were not the mere outbreakings of human frailty." Of whom then? With equal certainty, we may answer,—Not of Him who was one with the Father, to whom this mysterious prayer was addressed; but of the God-man, the Redeemer, in whom are indissolubly united the human and the divine natures. The evangelist Luke, in his account of the scene at Gethsemane, affords strong evidence of the truth of this position. The passage to which we refer is, indeed, not found in several of the ancient versions, as, for instance, the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Codex Vaticanus; but occurs in such a vast number of manuscripts as to leave no doubt of its authenticity: "There appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." Luke xxii, 44. Who is meant by the "*him*," here spoken of? It certainly is not intimated that the mere humanity of the Redeemer is intended; for it would seem to follow that if an angel might strengthen a creature for that work, an angel might have effected the entire

redemption of a world. Equally clear is it—our author to the contrary notwithstanding—that a created being could not, in any sense of the word, strengthen the omnipotent God. He, to whom the evangelist applies this language, was, then, a being able to redeem, and yet susceptible of receiving strength from a creature. In the language of the apostle, when he exclaims, "Great is the mystery of godliness," we say it was God manifest in the flesh—Jesus, the Christ, very God and very man. Throughout his entire career is seen this union of two natures in one person. When kept in view, the whole tenor of Scripture is plain and intelligible: when lost sight of, a great proportion of it becomes involved in inexplicable contradiction. While it is gloriously true, in the language of the prophet, that "thy Redeemer is the Holy One of Israel, and that the Lord of hosts is his name," it is equally clear and it *must* be true, that the entire work of redemption was wrought out by that *Son of man* to whom the first promise referred, when, like a ray of light, it shot athwart the darkness of a ruined world, proclaiming, and placing on imperishable record the proclamation,—"The *seed of the woman* shall bruise the serpent's head."

Hence, it will be seen that there is no foundation for the first of the "serious objections" brought by our author against the orthodox doctrine upon this subject, namely, that "it subtracts from the atonement its vital principle, and substitutes the sufferings and death of the creature for the sufferings and death of the Creator." It does no such thing. It revolts alike from the "death of the Creator," and from attributing salvation to the sufferings of a mere creature. It is in the union of the two natures, in the person of Christ Jesus, that it sees a Redeemer who has learned, by experience, to sympathize with those whom he is not ashamed to call his brethren; and at the same time is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God by him. Himself the priest, himself the victim.

In reply to another of our author's objections to the prevalent theory, that "it strengthens the Unitarian error," an objection, seemingly, with him, of great weight, it is only necessary to say, that while we fully agree with him as to the dangerous nature of that heresy, and give him credit for his zeal, we have no faith in any weapons to be used against it that are not drawn from the armory of truth. Nay, in our judgment, it is better that Unitarianism, under its ever-changing phases and various names, should continue, as it has done for more than fifteen centuries, to "threaten the system of the Christian faith," than that it should be put down—even if it might be put down—by bad logic and a manifest wresting of the sacred oracles. From errorists of that, or any other.

class, the church of God has nothing to fear, so long as, trusting in the promises of her great Head, she contends earnestly, *and honestly*, "for the faith once delivered to the saints." We say this on the supposition that our author's assertion is true, and that the general prevalence of his doctrine would, in his own language, "extirpate the Unitarian heresy." That it would have no tendency to do this is equally evident from the history of the Apollinarian error, and from the manner in which the Arians have conducted their side of the controversy in all ages.

But our author is not more unfortunate in his attempts to establish his own theory, than unfair in his statements of the doctrine as held by the orthodox churches of Christendom. It is not true, as he states in "another objection," that "according to the prevalent theory, his [Christ's] suffering was finite. It reached his humanity alone. It was only the suffering of the finite man."—P. 290.

What our author calls the "prevalent theory," we prefer to give in the words of others, lest we might seem to be traveling out of the record, and propounding a theory of our own, in opposition to the views of our author. "We may admit," says Dr. Hill, "that the Godhead cannot suffer, and we do not pretend to explain the kind of support which the human nature derived, under its sufferings, from the divine, or the manner in which the two were united. But from the uniform language of Scripture, which magnifies the love of God in giving his only-begotten Son, which speaks in the highest terms of the preciousness of the blood of Christ, which represents him as coming, in the body that was prepared for him, to do that which sacrifice and burnt-offering could not do; from all this we infer there was a value, a merit in the sufferings of this person, superior to that which belonged to the sufferings of any other: and as the same Scriptures intimate, in numberless places, the strictest union between the divine and human natures of Christ by applying to him promiscuously the actions which belong to each nature, we hold that it is impossible for us to separate in our imagination this peculiar value which they affix to his sufferings, from the peculiar dignity of his person." Still more explicit and stronger is the language of Watson: "That which carries the value of the offering to its true height—if we can call that height which is above all height—is, that it was 'the blood of Christ,' of the whole undivided Christ, who was both God and man. For though a *divine nature* could not bleed and die, a *divine Being* could. This distinction is to be kept in mind; for, the *person being one*, the acts and sufferings of each nature are the acts and sufferings of the same person, and are spoken of interchangeably. It is this inti-

mate and inseparable connection of the divinity of our Lord, this hypostatical union with his person and work, which gave to both that exclusive peculiarity which lays the foundation of our absolute faith. . . . . It is this which invests his humanity with that divine character; so that by virtue of the personal union, we worship him without idolatry, as God. Thomas touches his very flesh, and yet falls at his feet and cries out, My Lord and my God!"*

To the same point speaks Robert Hall: "There was a mysterious and inconceivable union between the divine nature of the Son of God, and the man Christ Jesus. But when we attempt to develop this mystery, and inquire how this union was effected and maintained without the two natures being identified, or their respective properties being confounded, we are utterly at a loss. . . . This, which has been styled the hypostatical union,—in consequence of which, the blood shed upon the cross, *being the blood of God's own Son*, possesses that marvelous efficacy by which it cleanses from all sin,—will probably remain for ever an impenetrable secret."†

It is unfair and uncandid, therefore, in our author so to misrepresent the general creed of the church as to make it ridiculous, in order that he may the more successfully demolish it, and build upon its ruins. He ought to have known that it is not true, that "under the prevalent theory *the holy union* suffered not."—P. 75. He did know, that by no evangelical writer of any note, nor yet, as we believe, by any of the humblest followers of the Lamb, is the suffering of Christ ever spoken or thought of, in a way to authorize such language as the following:—

"The theory which holds that the suffering element in the person of Christ was *only the little speck* of his humanity, with the inference to which it inevitably leads of the minuteness of the subtraction from the bliss of his united person, caused by the suffering of *that human speck*, cannot but detract immeasurably from the dignity and glory of the atonement. . . . The *minute atom* of his human suffering, compared with the mighty totality of his divine beatitude, was less than the scarcely perceptible *speck* that often passes over without obscuring the orb of day."—Pp. 92, 93.

We cannot allow ourselves to think, however, that these and similar perversions and distortions of the Christian faith arose from any more blameworthy source than ignorance on the part of our author. Whatever may be his age or standing in the world, he is evidently but a young Christian. His reading has been directed

* Sermons, vol. i, p. 383. † Works, vol. iii, p. 317.

rather to other sciences than to theology. Hence, when quoting from "the illustrious Chalmers," and "the distinguished Harris," passages which set forth with clearness and power the truly orthodox sentiments upon this great theme, he tells his readers (p. 52) and repeats the declaration, (p. 209)—"The remarks we are about to quote first reached our knowledge *after* these sheets were prepared for the press."

In speaking of the limited extent of his theological reading he uses this language:—

"With all the multitudinous volumes of theological lore, the countless progeny of the unceasing travail of eighteen centuries, there is but one created being that can claim universal familiarity. That being is the worm. It alone, of finite beings, has bibliothecal ubiquity. The hugest tomes appal it not. To fastidiousness of taste it is a stranger. It feeds not on the ambrosia of genius alone. Its never-satiated appetite loathes not even the offals of polemical dullness. To rivalship with the worm, in compass of research, we dare not aspire."—P. 51.

'Tis a pity to spoil so eloquent a passage; yet in reading it we could not help asking whether it is of one worm or of the entire genus that the author is speaking; and if of the latter, whether it is not just as true that man has also "bibliothecal ubiquity." Though he dare not aspire in compass of research to rivalship with *the* worm, yet is our author's misapprehension of the evangelical doctrine of the sufferings of Christ ample evidence that, like *a* worm, his "feeding" has been confined to a very limited theological library. It is absolutely unpardonable that any man, professing to be an orthodox disciple, should, in these days, when the true faith is assailed on every hand by avowed enemies, allow himself to throw into the church a volume based upon a false assumption, and coolly tell his readers that a knowledge of the evangelical doctrine first reached him "after these sheets were prepared for the press."

Here we take our leave of "a Layman." To himself, personally unknown as he is, we have, and can have, nothing but kind feelings. The mawkish tenderness and gingerly hesitation with which many of the religious periodicals of the day have expressed their dissent from his doctrines, have induced us to speak of *them*, and of the arguments by which they are sustained, in a manner, which, perhaps, with all our care, may wound *him;* and which may induce him to wish, as we certainly do, that instead of rushing half-armed into open hostility with the faith of Christendom, he had continued, in the language quoted by himself in his preface,

> "Along the cool sequester'd vale of life,
> To keep the noiseless tenor of his way."

ART. V.—*Upham's Psychological and Theological Works.*

1. *Mental Philosophy; embracing the three Departments of the Intellect, Sensibilities, and Will.* 3 vols., 12mo.
2. *A Philosophical and Practical Treatise on the Will.*
3. *Outlines of Imperfect and Disordered Mental Action.*
4. *Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life; designed particularly for the Consideration of those who are seeking Assurance of Faith and Perfect Love.* Fourth edition.
5. *Life of Catharine Adorna, including some leading Facts and Traits in her Religious Experience, with Explanations, Remarks, &c.*
6. *The Life of Faith, in three Parts, embracing some of the Scriptural Principles or Doctrines of Faith, the Power or Effects of Faith, in the Regulation of Man's Inward Nature, and the Relation of Faith to the Divine Guidance.* Waite, Pierce, & Co., No. 1 Cornhill, Boston.

WE hope our readers will not be appalled by the array of metaphysical volumes at the head of this article. We are not about to blind them with subtil dust, or challenge their wonder at our skill in hair splitting. We shall present them merely a dish of *olla podrida*. It is our wish to submit some rather cursory remarks on the productions of a native and very meritorious author, whom his country should more fully appreciate; and, availing ourselves, at the same time, of the licensed versatility of the Review, make some devious glances at topics which are related to both our subject and the times.

A review of the first half of these volumes is almost superfluous at this date: they have been our text-books in the United States for years, and the maturest teachers and professors have given them a decisive verdict. Dr. Woods pronounces Upham a "charming writer," and says,—"His views are well expressed and well guarded." He places him "among the best writers on the various subjects which he has treated." Professor Stuart says,—"I have no hesitation in saying, that I regard Professor Upham's books as giving the best views of the subjects named which we have in the English language." The New-York Review (a good authority in its day) says,—"Out of all the systematic treatises in use, we consider the volumes of Mr. Upham by far the best that we have." The Biblical Repository declares,—"His system is not a copy of any other, but without any apparent effort at novelty, is strongly marked with original thought."

His work on the will is not so generally known. We cannot indorse it fully, nor can we any other author on that insolvable problem; but his Treatise is certainly more satisfactory to the Arminian school than any of its predecessors. It modifies quite away the Cyclopean mound of difficulty reared by Edwards. Dr. Fisk said of the Treatise on the Will,—"I have read it with great satisfaction. It is certainly a better analysis of this difficult subject, in my judgment, than anything I have before seen in relation to it. I might, if this were the proper time, it is true, make some queries on some of the points presented in the work, but on the whole I cannot but believe it will go far toward harmonizing the hitherto discordant views connected with this subject."

The excellences of Dr. Upham's works on Mental Philosophy are manifold.

1. Their arrangement is natural, and consequently simple. It is divided into three departments,—the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will, and thus traces the mental phenomena in their obvious series.

2. They are strictly inductive. No elaborate hypothesis is assumed as a nucleus to which all mental phenomena must bend and adhere. The writer deals in facts, and draws his sober conclusions from the common experience of mankind, the evidence of ordinary language, the pathological manifestations of the mind, consciousness, &c.

3. Their style is remarkably clear; in many instances ornate, perhaps in some diffuse.

4. They are eminently Christian in their character. They are evidently the production of a devout mind. The authority of the moral sense is distinctly recognized and defined. We cannot too highly recommend them to all our young preachers. No theologian should be ignorant of the philosophy of the mind; and there are no works extant which can take precedence of these, as a perspicuous and comprehensive introduction to the whole science.

There is one general characteristic of the psychological works of Professor Upham, which we would more strongly emphasize: we refer to their soundly healthful and English character, in contradistinction to the transcendental and hypothetical schools of Germany and France. Professor Stuart has recommended them as especially "adapted to these times, when the public mind is allured by books on these subjects, in many respects dreamy and unintelligible to the great mass of readers."

We must take advantage of the present notice to indulge a few remarks on the prevalent philosophical speculations of the times.

Their transcendental extravagances have excited not a little attention and curiosity. They have exerted a serious influence on the religious opinions of many, and have infected, to some extent, the youthful intellects of our learned institutions, especially in New-England, where they have been most in vogue. The daring which these speculations assume gives them the high and attractive air of intellectual courage; the unquestionable erudition which has been amassed around them lends them the dignity of authority; while their combination, of late, with a fanciful poetry and an ideal literature, gives them the charms of an effeminate and meretricious taste. They thus appeal at once to the presumptuous, the obsequious, and the sentimental.

We have spent many a late hour (we reproach ourselves by mentioning it) in threading the mazes of this metaphysical labyrinth; yet if we pretended to comprehend the system, we should certainly *be wise above what is written*, and equally so above those who have written. We enter here, therefore, into no examination of the logic of this philosophy; it is at once its security and its absurdity, that it is too aerial to be tangible to the grasp of syllogisms. Its only reasoning is revery. It has, however, two or three capital characteristics upon which we must remark briefly.

Its main defect is its *hypothetical spirit*. Nothing is more insisted upon by Cousin than that his method is *inductive*. But to our Beotian head the assumption is as vain as it is emphatic. His system is indeed eclectic—it gleans from all others, but his hypothesis is prior to his facts; the latter are subordinate to the former, not the former to the latter. This is the strong distinction between the English and the continental philosophies. The sturdy common sense of the Anglo-Saxon mind has marked the whole progress of our philosophical inquiries, and we are happy to see it still maintaining its old vigor in the works of Dr. Upham. No sweeping hypothesis, comprehending all things, and pronouncing, with imperious dogmatism, its verdicts, has been tolerated in the philosophical inquiries of the English mind. The principles of Bacon are adhered to here as well as in the physical sciences. The desultory and confused conversation of a few friends on metaphysical subjects suggested to Locke his ideas on the limitations of the human understanding; the origin, nature, and relations of ideas form the scope of his great, though defective, work. Berkeley, seizing on one thought of Locke, that "ideas of sensation are often changed by the judgment," wrought out his beautiful discovery of the theory of vision, a psychological fact, and lived to see it experimentally demonstrated by the celebrated operation of

Cheselden; and though transcendental in many of his speculations, this is his only doctrine that the English mind has placed in the list of its acknowledged philosophical truths. Edwards wrote on the will. Hartley confined his labors to one great point, the association of ideas, and left it almost perfect. Reid, it has been justly said, does not refute Locke, but modifies and explains him; and the Scotch school are honored, not reproached, by the name with which Cousin would stigmatize their philosophy,—the "Scotch common sense."

In this gradual and inductive manner has the English philosophy advanced, until the introduction of the German vagaries by Coleridge, and his imitators on this side the Atlantic. Scarcely a British author has attempted a complete system of the mind, because in so doing too much must be merely hypothesis. Dr. Upham's system is indeed general and comprehensive: he treats of the entire mind, but he does it by combining into a whole the results of the research of his predecessors on insulated subjects of the science; he presents, in a collective form, all that has been discovered, without attempting hypothetical solutions of what remains yet unsolved.

The process of the continental speculations has been in direct contrast with that of the English. Their seminal principle was Kant's theory of the *pure reason*. His successor, Fitche, evaporated into pure *idealism*. Schelling succeeded, with a proclamation of *pantheism;* and Hegel followed, resolving all things into utter *nihilism*. Not content with the induction of those mental matters of fact which have attracted and limited the speculations of English philosophers, these bounding speculators have leaped from the finite to the infinite, and have fallen back again headlong, not into the finite, but the lower abyss of nihilism. Cousin was trained by Royer Collard in the doctrines of the Scotch school; but they were too tame for him, and he expresses the fancifulness of his present system, when he tells us that he adopted it because it "embraced, in one splendid generalization, God, man, and the universe." This is not the genuine spirit of philosophy,—"a spirit which," says Brown, "is quick to pursue whatever is within the reach of the human intellect; but which is not less quick to discern the bounds that limit every human inquiry, and which, therefore, in seeking much, seeks only what man may learn."

It is gratifying to find that the sober, practical sense of the Anglo-Saxon mind cannot be long beguiled by such illusions. While Germany and France have been crazed for ages with every species of metaphysical mania, school rising upon the ruins of

school, each proving the other absurd—while their whole literature and religion have been modified by their speculations, the English mind has kept its old practical course of inquiry, applying its Baconian principles almost as rigorously to metaphysics as to physics. The French could learn only sensualism and materialism from Locke; the English have learned from him common sense. The designation, "common sense," applied to the Scotch philosophers in contempt, is, we repeat, a noble eulogy. Opposing schools have never been produced by the Anglo-Saxon mind. And whatever ferment an occasional translator or imitator, like Coleridge or Carlyle, may excite, it is soon forgotten amidst sterner inquiries. You can no more divert John Bull's intellect from this course, than you can his stomach from roast beef. It is no defect; it shows the robustness of his mental constitution. All practical arts, and solid learning, and truly refining literature, have his hearty respect, and in them he excels all other modern people; but on this emasculate nonsense he looks with either astonishment or contempt. In philosophy the English mind has had a Bacon, in metaphysics a Locke, in physics a Newton, in theology a Butler, in the drama a Shakspeare, and in the epic a Milton. None of the nations which contemn it as obtuse can rival these names. They are a sufficient vindication of the Anglo-Saxon intellect the world over.

Another characteristic of the transcendental speculators to which we object is, the *affectation in style and sentiment* which marks most of them, especially our own. The *pure reason* which Kant says intuitively recognizes the fundamental principles of truth, is, in their opinion, an afflatus of divinity. Hence they are inspired. Mr. Emerson, who may be considered the representative of the transcendental system in this country, is an ideal pantheist: to him and his followers God is revealed in every flower and mote, essentially, identically, not merely in the effects of his wisdom and power. Hence a morbid, fanciful admiration, if not adoration, of nature. It is utterly the reverse of a pure and healthful taste; it is effeminate, and in many cases melancholy. We love nature, and poetry, which is the reflection of nature—we court their sweet exhilarations—but we shrink from the tremulous sensitiveness of these ruminating minds. Such susceptibility was not a characteristic of the classic intellect. The Greeks and Romans have excelled all others in taste: their judgments of nature and of art, their poetry, oratory, sculpture, and architecture, are the models of the world; but they knew nothing of this feminine sensibility. A manly vigor, an intellectual mightiness, pervade all their works. The taste which we condemn, though pre-eminent in these pseudo metaphysicians,

is not, we regret, peculiar to them. In our modern poetry we mistake, frequently, *hypochondriasis* for *pathos*. What a morbid melancholy pervades our most popular authors! White, Mrs. Hemans, Burns, and many of the love pieces of Moore and Byron, cannot be read without leaving the mind depressed with an enfeebling sentiment of—we scarcely know what—something akin to whining grief. "Sentimentalism" is a modern germination of the heart. It is not found in the old Greek tragedy, nor in the Latin love poets, nor in the amorous Fablieux of the middle ages. None of our earlier writers are marred with it. There are imagination, passion, and pathos in them all, but they are all healthful; there is nothing enervating, nothing whining. Take the most love-sick passages of Anacreon—what voluptuous passion, and yet what healthful, racy vigor they possess! The stamina of the ancient mind gives an energy and elevation to the softest manifestations of the passions in all the classic poets. Our standard writers are of the same character. You will look in vain for the girlish sentimentalism of the later poets in the noble verse of Chaucer, Spenser, Milton, or Shakspeare. If it is excusable in our poets, it never can be in our metaphysicians. In them we look for clear and profound thought, not rhapsody, or puling sentiment. We know of but one of them to whom the charge is not applicable; we refer to Brownson; but he was so determined on a "hop, skip, and jump" progress, that he did not wait long enough for a thorough infection. Emerson and Alcott are unquestionably moon-smitten.

This affectation extends even to the article of style. The pure, simple, strenuous words of "English undefiled," in which Locke expresses the most abstruse phenomena of mind, Butler the profoundest principles of theology and ethics, and Shakspeare the noblest sentiments of poetry, are rent and twisted into all fantastical involutions, to conform them to the vagaries of a foreign and flatulent literature. We need not give examples: they have been quoted in the public prints to the laughter of all sensible men.

It is an intolerable misnomer to call this dreamy nonsense philosophy. Philosophers! Socrates, Bacon, and Locke, would doff the cloak, if they were required to share the name with our transcendental school. These philosophers, so called, have sprung from Unitarianism. Mr. Emerson may be considered their truest type; a gentleman of singular intellectual traits; such a one as nature would produce if she should attempt to make a philosopher, but before she were half way through the effort, should abandon it to make a poet; and, finding this impracticable, should give up

in despair, having formed neither, but an intellectual hermaphrodite. Mr. Emerson, we have said, is an ideal pantheist. His little book on "Nature" heartily advocates the Berkeleian doctrine, and, like all his lectures, abounds in such rhapsodical beauties, such dreamy conceptions, as we never should have believed could be sublimated from the tough energies of a Yankee brain. He is a literary phantasm. But few men of mature minds or mature years, we believe, have entered into the speculations which have been the amusement and contempt of our eastern states for the last few years: yet they have found a wide sway among the youths of our colleges, some of the younger clergy, and that large class in all our cities and chief villages whose unfortunate education enables them to converse allusively on all subjects, without an accurate idea of any. The authors of the famous "Pursuits of Literature" would have reveled in such *materiele* for satire as their lyceum dissertations, literary circles, esthetic tea-parties, oracular phraseology with the obsolete termination in *th*, and their mawkish sentimentalism have afforded. Coleridge himself was not half *spirituelle* enough for the New-England school. A smattering of French rendered the lucid style of Cousin somewhat intelligible, but even he retained too much of the "common sense" of the Scotch school and Royer Collard. Teachers of German were next in requisition. Some scraps of the philosophers from Kant to Hegel, some of the sweet ideals of Schilling, and, above all, the phantasmagoria of the "Faust," came into circulation with the brilliancy of new coins. All tongues kindled with Goethe's name. It became at once as talismanic as St. Patrick's to an Irishman, and as familiar as "Lucy Long" to the boys in the street. Goethe, Goethe, Goethe, was reiterated in the "Dial," uttered amidst exploding plaudits in the lecture hall, and whined out in the esthetic evening party, until men who could appreciate his superb powers became sick of his name. A new class of ideas came into circulation. Discussions about a "higher life," "progress," the "ideal," were rife. "Orphic sayings" were solemnly put forth, such as neither Orpheus nor Hermes, assisted by all the gods and goddesses, could have interpreted. It seemed, indeed, that old things were to pass away, and all things become new. The Saviour of the world was even discovered to have been a mythic character—the Hebrew "ideal" of virtue—or, at most, but a philosophic teacher, to be classed with Confucius, Zoroaster, and Socrates. The apostles were most virtuous enthusiasts; the Gospels most beautiful myths, though, like all other religious legends, capable of much correction. The true idea of inspiration was discovered; the old He-

brew idea of it, as a dictation of the divine mind to selected teachers, was scorned; inspiration was found to be a universal pantheistic influence, however different in degree yet the same in nature, in the prophecies of Isaiah and in what Coleridge has justly called the "vulgarity, licentiousness, and blasphemy," of the Faust. Every man had a right to feel himself an imbodied Jove. Our old men began to scratch their heads, the old ladies to gape with wonder, the young men wrote transcendental verses, the young maidens talked of "the mystery of being," and the old ones wrote dissertations against matrimony, advocating intellectual *liasons* between the sexes,* and presided with learned gravity in conversaziones where such and similar subjects were discussed.

Now ridiculous as all this pedantic nonsense was, it became quite infectious. The discussions of Ripley, Parker, Emerson, &c., together with the congenial character of the Unitarian theology, tended to nourish it, until it amounted to an epidemic. It would afford an interesting and admonitory lesson to trace *its religious tendency*. Though it has somewhat abated, yet being essentially infidel, it has sapped the religious opinions of many. What slight religious sentiments remained among the youth of our Unitarian churches have been quite neutralized by it.

It is a fact which cannot be denied, and which is acknowledged and lamented by many Unitarians, that their churches are subterfuges for hosts of speculative, if not practical, infidels, men who, if there were none but evangelical churches around them, would find themselves compelled to acknowledge their unbelief, and renounce the forms of religion, which are now, with them, but hollow pretences. In objecting to Unitarianism, we would not denounce Unitarians. We pretend not to determine how far a man may err on the particular points in controversy with them, and be a Christian. Still the fact we assert is unquestionable. A genuine revival of religion would, in most of their churches, drive a large part of their principal hearers away in disgust. We have had occasion to learn the internal state of Unitarianism, and we are compelled to say, that a more powerless, lifeless, vacant form of Christianity we have not known. With sparse congregations, didactic prelections in the pulpit, rather than preaching, scarcely any definite opinions among its communicants, no social devotional meetings, and a general absence of domestic worship in its families, it is precisely what men who disbelieve all religion, but wish the disguise of its public forms, would ask. And we affirm, that it has been made such by its so-called philosophical exegesis—

* See the "Great Law-suit,—man *versus* woman,"—in the "Dial."

its speculative Germanism. Many of its clergy have the most vague ideas of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures. Palfrey, while an instructor in its theological school, could dispute portions of the sacred canon. Emerson could defend, before its university, the sheerest pantheism. Parker, occupying the pulpit as pastor of a church, and exchanging occasionally with his brethren, could, night after night, lecture to thousands against the fundamental positions of Christianity—his attacks as severe as those of Rousseau—his compliments to it not half so cordial as those of the Swiss infidel; and the weekly organ of the sect in Boston can publish, week after week, ably-written articles to defend Universalism, and promote a union of the two bodies.

Let it not be said, in reply, that this is the result of a tolerance of free inquiry. This is but acknowledging the charge. This is the ruinous defect of the sect. We are the stanchest friends of the rights of conscience, but this does not oblige us to enter into compact with all crazed and vagrant thinkers, by which they may have the privilege of corrupting our children. We will admit to our platform all who agree with us, and let all others have their own, and thereon have full and fair play. This is the right principle of free discussion—the only tenable one for rational men.

Unitarianism, by its speculative philosophy, has become the subterfuge of our semi-infidelity. Enter into the social intercourse of Unitarians, converse much with them, with even their clergy, and you will find a general absence of experimental views of religion; such opinions of the Holy Scriptures as must invalidate their saving influence; such an estimate of Christian ordinances as must neutralize their renewing power. Talk with them of conviction for sin by the Holy Spirit, of penitence, justification by faith, peace in believing, the witness of the Spirit, sanctification, the life of faith; and though they may use your terminology, you will find that they comprehend not your meaning.

Some efforts have recently been made to excite a better religious spirit in the sect, but they will never succeed without a virtual abandonment of the system; a return to the common-sense philosophy of the Bible. Religious communities, like the Church of England in Wesley's day, and New-England in Edwards's, may become practically degenerate, while their standards of doctrine remain. Such retain the means of their renovation. But where the foundations are dislodged, there is no hope but in taking down the building, removing its rubbish, and relaying the basis. The tendency of such is from bad to worse, till the evil exhausts itself, and reaction follows. Thus it was with the speculations of the

French in the last century, and thus it is with the Socinianism of Germany, France, and Switzerland. Sheer infidelity is their crisis. Parkerism, that is philosophical Germanism, is the newest phase of Unitarianism in New-England.

These imparted speculations have uprooted the religious convictions of not only many among the educated, but they have had an extensive *popular influence*, and have imbodied themselves in a form, however precarious, of popular organization. The whole nation has been amused several times within two or three years by accounts of the proceedings of certain conventions held in New-England, for the purpose of promoting the abolition of the sabbath, the ministry, the church, &c. These conventions are a product of the speculations—the revolt from evangelical orthodoxy—which the new philosophy has introduced. Its terminology forms the dialect of their cant. The supremacy of the reason, the mythic and obsolete character of the Bible, the inspiration of all great minds, &c., are the ideas which are rife in their discussions. They are headed by some of the sons of the *elite* of the community, whose names are historical in the old commonwealth of Massachusetts. While the leaders are cool-headed adepts in the new philosophical liberalism, the mass, who compose these whimsical assemblies, have caught but vague ideas of it; yet these vague ideas are intoxicating to them by their novelty, and the sudden rupture of all the old ligaments of religious belief and restraint which they induce. The popular partisans enter into them and propose practical applications of them with genuine popular enthusiasm. They have, in fact, become infected with a species of fanaticism for the new skepticism. They are infidel through credulity. Paradoxical as this may seem, it is a common fact in the natural history of the human mind. Infidelity frequently arises from sheer credulity. Herbert published his celebrated work by the advice of an apparition, and Bolingbroke was afraid of spectres. Infidelity is not altogether negative—if it denies a creator, it must affirm creation to be by chance; and it is a greater stretch of credulity to believe that the mechanism of the universe resulted from a concourse of atoms, than to believe it the work of an intelligent cause; hence unbelief is sometimes itself fanatical, and much more is the semi-infidelity referred to.

It is not a reform of the ministry, sabbath, church, &c., that is proposed by these restless men, but their extirpation. They believe abuses inseparable from the existence of these institutions. If they have not the principles, yet they have many of the practical ends, of the French revolutionists, and an unsparing enthusiasm strikingly

similar. The obvious fanaticism of this movement has led many to suppose that it would remedy itself. This is a mistake. Its enthusiasm is its danger. Enthusiasm has wrought every triumph of error in the history of our world. The victories of Mohammedanism, the prevalence of Popery, the success of Mormonism, and a thousand other delusions, would never have been effected without this one element. The cool, skeptical logic of Herbert, Hume, and Bolingbroke, never created a popular party. The opinions of the French philosophers never produced a popular interest until they connected with them great practical measures, suited to excite the popular enthusiasm. Then it was that they became mighty and subverted the throne, and the altar, and scathed all Europe. We can scarcely conceive of a project against Christianity more plausible to the popular mind than the one now noticed,—appealing as it does to the natural hostility of men to religion, and the many imperfections of the church, and connecting itself as it ostensibly has of late with the greatest political question of the country, —the abolition of slavery. It has projected a vast series of popular conventions—a hundred a year in some instances—and is sending forth its agents through all the north-western as well as north-eastern states. It is in fine a vast practical scheme of infidelity, having the rare fortune never before achieved by speculative skepticism, except in the French Revolution, of imbodying in its plans a large amount of popular energy.

We affirm again that this movement, identified as it may be with many popular absurdities, has come of the spurious philosophy of which we have spoken. They both first appeared in the east, they were coincident in time, and are coincident in their principal sentiments and phraseology, and the leaders in the one are the firmest adherents of the other. Parker is their chaplain, Garrison their rostrum-orator, Quincy and Philips their managers, Burleigh and Lowell their bards, and Emerson and Alcott their philosophers.

The history of these new psychological and theological speculations *has been marked by considerable literary aspiration.* Their votaries have declared that the nation is growing up without a national literature—that the practical severity of our Saxon intellect produced by the influence of Bacon, Locke, the Scotch philosophers, and above all by our vigorous theology, has congealed the fountains of sentiment and originality, and prevented the development of a national taste. Doubtless, all wise efforts toward a more characteristic national literature are desirable; we hail them with the heartiest good wishes; but we think time is the chief necessity. Nations advance gradually, as do individuals. Give us time, gen-

tlemen; we have the germ in the soil, and it will in due season rise and display its glories like our native magnolia. But forbear your hot-house processes, and especially keep away your exotics, which can only sicken in our soil, and shed malaria on our moral atmosphere. Receive the word of exhortation, gentlemen. Know ye not, that the first condition of a national literature is that it be a type of the national character, and that national character depends largely upon the physical circumstances of a people? And that these, in this land, are just the reverse of the hair-splitting philosophy and liquefied sentimentalism ye offer us? What is this new world? A vast field for tugging labor and practical arts, immense mines of metal and fuel, mountains of iron, rivers running from the pole to the tropics, prodigious inland seas. And what are the people upon it? What were their fathers? Men who threw defiance at their oppressors in the iron bolts of their strong Saxon speech, and confounded the conquerors of the world in fields where yet stand the stumps of the primal forests; a race of stout-hearted fighters, stout-minded thinkers, and stout-handed workers, loving liberty, laboring for their bread, and serving their God. And who are their posterity? Men who are filling the seas with ships, binding the land in belts of iron, digging canals through mountains, and who—solemnly sublime spectacle—are marching with a van line from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, westward on the falling forest, at the rate of seventeen miles a year, rearing temples, founding cities, and casting manfully the destinies of the future.

And what does the history of the mind of this hardy race teach? It has produced the Quadrant,* the Steamer, the Cotton-gin, the Magnetic Telegraph, the practical Franklin in philosophy, the severe Edwards in theology, the erudite Webster in philology, the incorruptible Washington in arms, the energetic Henry in eloquence, the whole band of clear-headed, far-seeing statesmen of the revolution. It has had its artists, but all who have won a permanent fame except one have shared the severity of the national taste; its Stuart, and Healey, and Inman, in portraiture, its West and Trumbull in historic painting. It has produced but one great romantic painter, —Allston. Sculpture is the severest and noblest of the fine arts; it declines the charms of coloring, and its stern beauties inhere only in the solid stone: our land has just placed one of her sons at the head of the art, and has placed others of her children hard by him.

Such a people must have a literature vigorous, strenuous, manly. You must alter their land and the texture of their brain before you can

* Hadley's Quadrant was invented by Godfrey of Pennsylvania.

take from them their strong Saxon speech, or their robust common sense, and you must liquefy their hearts before they will cast away, as obsolete, that old volume, the truths of which their fathers believed as utterances from heaven, and under the sanctions of which they fought the battles of their liberty, and laid the foundations of their country.

This is the land and such the people for whom you would create a philosophy and a literature. They have shown themselves capable of anything great; but nothing does their history more fully demonstrate, than the impossibility of grafting on their sturdy intellectual growth the imported follies which you offer them. The men who would become their literary leaders must be intellectual athletæ; must study their stupendous scenery, their energetic life, and reflect in their writings their strenuous traits.

We have extended these remarks too far already for most of our readers, and have indulged ourselves too far in the wide range we proposed in the outset; but there are young and elevated minds which pant for truth, and read with eagerness everything on these subjects. We would admonish them against the decorated illusions of this exotic philosophy; we would teach them to despise its emasculated spirit, which would dilute our vigorous literature, unnerve the old energy of our tongue, and evaporate our wholesome religion. We commend to them the able psychological works at the head of this article, as specimens of the true English philosophical spirit.

Let us now glance at the next half of the list at the head of our article. To us these volumes have an extraordinary interest. They are, in fact, discussions of the doctrine of Christian perfection—heretofore considered almost peculiar to our own church. It is certainly an interesting indication, that an authority so eminent among our Calvinistic neighbors is found fully committed to a tenet which we have had to defend almost alone for more than half a century among American Christians. It is equally interesting to notice the reception which his views receive from quarters, where assuredly we should have anticipated the outcry of "heresy." This is not because he has disguised the truth; for on the contrary there is no work in our language, not excepting our own writers, in which the doctrine of entire sanctification is more fully stated and applied than in the "Interior Life;" yet the keen Calvinistic critics of the New-Englander* at New-Haven, the Unitarian

* We understand the New-Englander not to dissent from the degree of Christian attainment taught by Professor Upham, but to the terms by which it is designated, and the opinion that it is attainable instantaneously, and by faith alone.

conductors of the Religious Miscellany at Boston, and our own Arminian Quarterly at New-York, have approved the main position of the book.

These three volumes are related to each other, and also to the psychological works already noticed. The "Interior Life" defines the nature and extent of Christian perfection. "Catharine Adorna" is an exemplification of it in the life of one of those extraordinary saints, who, even in the dark ages, hung on the ulcerous bosom of the Papal Church, and who, like Kempis, Gerson, and Fenelon, are proofs that God is never without witnesses on the earth. The "Life of Faith" is a discussion of the *evangelical condition* or *instrumentality* of the hidden life, somewhat anticipated, indeed, in the first of the series, but not sufficiently to supersede a separate and fuller exposition. They are related to the author's psychological works by the fact that they are founded on a philosophical basis, and that basis the psychological system which he has developed in his text-books. It has been justly remarked,* that though no one need possess a knowledge of mental philosophy in order to understand these treatises, yet no one will read them without procuring that knowledge. Their philosophical character, while it does not in the least detract from their popular adaptation, adds much to their interest. The intelligent reader never feels, as he peruses these pages, that he is treated with illusive reveries or pious rhapsodies, but that a sound and discriminating thinker, having advanced through the psychological study of the human soul until he stands on the acme of its intellectual structure, has caught from that position the sublime idea of its relations to the invisible world—the perception of its moral constitution and capabilities; that, in fine, this doctrine of Christian perfection is not merely a religious assumption,—the phraseology of cant,—but a sublime fact in the relations of the human soul—the ultimate philosophy of the mind. We have said that Dr. Upham's philosophical system classifies the mental phenomena under three heads: —the *intellect*, comprehending what some of the older logicians called perception, conception, judgment, &c.: the *sensibilities*, or the emotions and desires; the latter including the appetites, passions, affections, and sentiments: and the *will*, the source of voluntary, and therefore of moral action. All these are brought under review in his theological treatises, particularly in the first and last; and the extent to which each is affected by entire sanctification is traced. The whole moral man is anatomized, and every ramification of the hidden life is ascertained.

* Christian Advocate and Journal.

Besides these psychological traits, the works on the "Interior Life," and "Faith," abound in important theological dissertations. In the former, the definition of Christian perfection is lucid and well-guarded;—it corresponds essentially with Wesley. In stating the means of its attainment, we think the author remarkably happy. These are *self-consecration* and *faith;* the entire appropriation of all that we are and have unto God, and then the implicit belief that he accepts the sacrifice through the merit of Christ. Faith is, indeed, asserted to be the single condition of sanctification, as of justification; but the act of consecration is a preliminary to the condition in sanctification, as repentance is in justification. The author, we think, very wisely emphasizes this view of his subject. He would have his readers deliberately and systematically set apart themselves, and all that pertains to them, in a covenant of consecration to God. This act of consecration is a matter of consciousness; to him that makes it, the fact cannot be vague or equivocal: he *knows* it, and from the very laws of the mind must know it. He is then in the exact attitude for the next step, faith. God commands him to be holy; the promises are all yea and amen to those who dedicate themselves to a holy life; he has done so, he is conscious that he has done so; how then can he hesitate to believe and enter into rest?

The explanation of "appropriating faith" is very clear and satisfactory in the "Interior Life," but is illustrated and applied in the "Life of Faith" more fully and luminously than in any other work with which we are acquainted. The observations on the "Faith of Acceptance" we value most highly; and in respect to the chapters on a life of signs and manifestations, as compared with a life of faith, and on emotional experience, we agree with the New-Englander, that "they constitute a real and valuable contribution to the philosophy of the Christian life."

On the subtil question heretofore discussed at some length in this Review, viz., How far temptations can affect the sensibilities of a sanctified man without guilt, the Treatise on the Interior Life is as minute and discriminating as the difficulties of the subject will admit.

The Treatise on Faith, we think, will be more highly prized by the theological student than the Interior Life. It is more critical and elaborate. The First Part discusses some of the philosophical and Scriptural principles of faith. It asserts faith to be a natural law of our constitution, and an element in most of our relations with society. The difference between this natural principle and religious faith is clearly defined. Part the Second illustrates with

much minuteness the power of faith or its application to "man's inward nature." The author's psychological system is here again manifest. The relation of faith to the intellect, the sensibilities, and the will, is stated with much precision. Part Third illustrates "the relation of faith to the divine guidance or the operation of the Holy Ghost in the soul."

Thus much for the philosophy and theology of these works. In regard to their style we may repeat what the author himself has somewhere said respecting the papers of Addison, in the Spectator, on moral and psychological subjects, that the felicity of his diction often disguises the profundity of his observations, and leads his reader to undervalue their real ability. Professor Upham evidently writes without labor. Such facility is often a characteristic of loquacious superficiality; but sometimes also of fertility and ready insight. Walter Scott wrote his best works at the rate of nearly twelve volumes a year, and his most labored efforts were always his worst. There are occasional marks of diffuseness in the treatises on the Interior Life and Faith, as in the author's textbooks; but we doubt that they could be much more elaborated without injury to their popular adaptation. Theological and philosophical as we have described them to be, they are, nevertheless, eminently practical. They are designed for the mass, and a work is so far perfect as it is suited to its object. But there is a higher element in style than mere verbal arrangement. Two writers may use an equally careful phraseology, and, nevertheless, be totally distinguished in their style. Sameness of style exists only among common-place minds, where none of the strong traits which always give individuality to genius are found; for style, in fact, is more the result of subtil manifestations of intellectual and moral qualities than of a collocation of words. Taking the term in this higher sense, the style of these volumes has peculiar excellence. It flows like a limpid stream, sometimes meandering, indeed, but always through rich fields whose luxuriant growth is reflected from its transparent surface. The best style is that in which the *animus* of the writer is congenial with his subject, and blends with it like a lateral stream with the main current. Thus is it with these volumes. Their author's ideas flow from his heart as well as his head. The serenest temper, such as he teaches, pervades his pages, and that high and steadfast faith, that profound quietude of spirit and unutterable oneness with God, of which he treats, are obviously with him matters of experience as well as speculation. This congeniality of the author's style with his subject gives a charm to his religious works: we are reminded of Fenelon at

every page. It accounts, we think, for the comparatively cordial reception which they have met from such opposite quarters. The reader feels that polemical criticisms are idle here; that while the perspicuity of the discussion forbids them, its sacredness repels them, and unless strangely unimpressible, he will pass from chapter to chapter with a disposition, every moment increasing in docility and earnestness, to learn simply the truth, and will close at last, exclaiming, "Lord, I believe, help my unbelief."

Let it not be supposed that we are dealing in mere adulation. These works have their faults, and if we had set down solely to expose them, we might have made a very different sketch. The value of a good or great work does not, however, consist in its exemption from minute faults, but in its possessing great excellences. Hyper-critical tests would demolish the most splendid literary renown; the pages of Homer, Milton, and Shakspeare, are strewed with minute blunders. No fastidious thinker can read our author's religious volumes without wishing amendments, and the squeamish one may think he sees gross heresy in some passages where, however, there is but an occasional lack of fuller qualification.

One of the greatest defects of these volumes is what would be an excellence in more strictly scientific works, viz., the mutual dependence of the parts. Often in the discussion of a particular topic, positions are assumed which we see would be dangerous without qualification, and we conclude the subject without finding the necessary explanations; but meet them, it may be, in a far subsequent part of the book, without a word of reference to their previous necessity.

We think there is a marked defect also in the observations on the "Assurance of Faith." If we understand him, our author means by this phrase what we call the Witness of the Spirit; for he says, "It is a state of mind existing on the part of the subject of it which excludes doubt in relation to his own personal and religious acceptance." He limits this precious blessing to a state of entire sanctification; whereas it is our doctrine, and we thought that of all who admitted the "*knowledge* of sins forgiven," that the justified soul receives this divine witness before it reaches the higher state of entire purification. That he thus limits "assurance," we think is obvious from passages which the reader will observe on pages 122, 133, and 163–4 of the Treatise on Faith. Our author has not retrograded in this respect from the opinions of his own church, but has rather advanced a step beyond them; for it has, though somewhat against its older standards, generally

denounced the profession of a personal knowledge of acceptance with God as spiritual presumption.

A third fault is the want of stronger qualification in the chapters which directly or collaterally treat of Selfishness and Disinterestedness. "Catharine Adorna" is especially liable to abuse in these respects. The former editions of the "Interior Life" were marked by unguarded passages, which, however, were subsequently corrected at the suggestion of this Review. Still there is a general savor of the "devout error" of Fenelon and Hopkins about the whole book, and "Catharine Adorna" is thoroughly redolent of it. We consider it purely a metaphysical abstraction, capable of very little practical effect, good or evil; but so obviously untenable as to be unworthy the predilection which our author shows for it. In the work on Faith he has, however, fully guarded against its abuse. We think he gives the true doctrine of selfishness on pages 159, 170–3, 181, 364.

There is also a general tendency toward the spirit of the mystics in these three volumes. It is not carried too far, but the reader perceives it with tremulous misgivings, that the devout fascination of these sainted but mistaken writers may yet too fully imbue the author. He evidently consults them much; he has given us some of their choicest ideas, but has copied too much their style.

We must close here by recommending, and we would do it with all possible emphasis, these volumes to our theological readers, especially the "Interior Life," and "Life of Faith." Their defects are, in contrast with their excellences, but as spots on the sun. They are mines of theological gold.

Boston. S.

ART. VI.—1. *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D. D., late Head Master of Rugby School, and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, M. A. London: B. Fellows, 1844. 2 vols. 8vo. [Reprinted; New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1 vol. small 8vo.]

2. *The History of Rome.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D. D. London: 3 vols. 8vo. [Reprinted; New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 2 vols. 8vo. 1846.]

3. *Sermons, illustrative of the Interpretation of Scripture.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D. D. London: B. Fellows, 1845. 1 vol. 8vo.

4. *Introductory Lectures on Modern History.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D. D. Edited, from the second London Edition, with a Preface and Notes, by Henry Reed, M. A., Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1846.

5. *School Sermons, chiefly delivered in Rugby Chapel.* By THOMAS ARNOLD, D. D. London: B. Fellows, 1844. [Reprinted; New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1846.]

THOUGH we have placed several works at the head of this article, we shall confine our remarks chiefly to the first,—the *Life of Dr. Arnold.*

One of the first copies of this book that reached this country was placed in our hands, and, fond as we are of biography, we were somewhat startled by two sizeable volumes about the life of a man of whom we knew so little. We had, indeed, heard of Dr. Arnold as the prince of English schoolmasters; but the world is not used to reading two volumes of schoolmaster's biography. We knew that he had got out a tolerably good Thucydides, but *that* was no title to immortality. We were aware, too, of his labors in translating Niebuhr into a shape which Englishmen might be induced to look at: that he had fought the Oxford "malignants" long and well: and that he had made a most promising debut as lecturer on history in the ancient university: yet with all this he had never risen up, before our mind at least, into the dimensions of a great man; and we rather shrunk, as we have said, from the task of reading two octavos about his sayings and doings among men. Yet we took them, as in duty bound, determined at least to begin, if not to complete, their perusal. The oil of our evening lamp gave out before we laid the book aside; the first work of the morning was to renew our delightful task, and with expanding thoughts, and

throbbing heart, and mournful self-condemnation, and joyous hopes of self-recovery, we traveled on with the great *man*, revealed to us as it were from heaven, until at last, with tears that would not be restrained, we stood beside his death-bed. Never before did a biography so stir our inmost being, so awaken us from dreams of worldliness and selfishness, so convince us that goodness is the truest, surest foundation of greatness, so assure us that the busiest and most earnest human life, a life filled to overflowing with human anxieties, affections, labors, and sympathies, may yet be a life "hid with Christ in God." And not once only, but again and again have we read the book, with ever-fresh interest and ever-increasing advantage; and so strong is our conviction of its intrinsic value, and especially of its adaptation to our own times and our own country, that we would gladly place it in the hands of every man and boy in the land. We now invite our readers to tarry with us awhile, in communion with this book and with the noble man whose spirit gives it life, hoping that the hour thus spent will induce not a few of them to commune more fully with the Life of Thomas Arnold, and with CHRIST, in whom Thomas Arnold lived and died.

Born at Cowes, in Westmoreland, in 1795, he received his academical training at Winchester, where he remained until 1811. He was remarkable at this period for a tendency to indolence, an infirmity, however, which could not be suspected from the restless activity of his after life. He was remarked, also, for his fondness for history and geography; and even at fourteen, he was discriminating and skeptical enough to be indignant "at the numerous boasts which are everywhere to be met with in the Latin writers." "I verily believe," he adds, "that half, at least, of the Roman history is, if not totally false, at least scandalously exaggerated." In 1811 he was elected a scholar at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; and in 1815, fellow of Oriel College. At Corpus Christi he was associated with Keble, the well-known author of the *Christian Year*, and with Mr. Justice Coleridge, for whom he maintained an unabated affection to the end of his life. In Oriel he found a circle of young men who have made more impression upon the English mind than any sons of Oxford have produced since Wesley's time; —*Copleston*, now the accomplished bishop of Llandaff; *Whately*, world-renowned for his honest adherence to Christian truth, and his clear insight into the cause of men's errors; and *Hampden*, so famous for the persecution which he endured in 1836 from his former friends, who conspired, with what we cannot but consider an atrocious malignity, to crush a strong man that stood in their way.

Newman, too, the arch-heresiarch and apostate, and *Pusey*, his more cowardly and cunning coadjutor, connected themselves with Oriel just as Arnold left it,—the former, indeed, taking his vacant fellowship. But the mischief of these men was yet slumbering. Arnold attached himself closely to Whately, and, doubtless, owed many of his opinions to his intimacy with that eminent man. His principal studies were Aristotle, Thucydides, and Herodotus; and he retained his passion, especially for the former, in after years. Though full of life and frolic, (he was a boy, indeed, all his life long,) it was seen by his friends at Oxford, that there were in him the elements of a noble and powerful nature.

In 1818 Arnold was ordained deacon; in 1819, settled at Laleham, in 1820 he was married. He remained nine years at Laleham, taking a few young men as private pupils in preparation for the universities. In more than one sense this was the great turning-point of his life. He seems at this period to have taken deeper and stronger views of duty than he had known before: to have considered well the life that lay before him, and to have marked out his course with the most complete self-command, and yet with the most complete self-abasement. His indolent habits were brushed away like cobwebs; the vague and ill-defined ambition which besets so many strong young men, and which seems to have possessed him during his younger years, was banished for ever: more than all, certain religious doubts, which had caused him much perplexity, were utterly put to flight,—not, indeed, by intellectual processes, but by what is far more effectual, the regimen of "holy living, prayer, and visiting the poor," and by a living union of his heart with CHRIST, a union so deep, so intense, so absorbing, that, as his biographer remarks, "the impression on those around him was often as though he knew what others only believed, as though he had seen what others only talked about." His outward life at Laleham was calm and tranquil; but he was then preparing the weapons which he was afterward to use on many a stormy battle-field, and forming himself, by a steadfast adherence to the line of every-day duty, for times of trial in which all his powers of nerve and endurance were to be called into requisition. His school-life here took the character which was afterward so splendidly developed in the larger sphere of Rugby: a character whose basis was laid in his thorough devotion to his work, as a work worthy the whole life and energies of a Christian minister. One of his pupils writes thus of his work at Laleham:—

"His hold on all his pupils perfectly astonished me. It was not so much an enthusiastic admiration for his genius, or learning, or elo-

quence, which stirred within them: it was a sympathetic thrill, caught from a spirit that was earnestly at work in the world—whose work was healthy, sustained, and constantly carried forward in the fear of God—a work that was founded in a deep sense of duty, and its value; and was coupled with such a true humility, such an unaffected simplicity, that others could not help being invigorated by the same feeling, and with the belief that they, too, in their measure, could go and do likewise."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 41.

At Laleham, too, he first displayed the almost incredible industry which formed so marked a feature of his subsequent character. Lessons began at seven in the morning, and, with the interval of breakfast, lasted till nearly three; then he would walk or *skirmish* (as he called it) across the country, and dine at half-past five. "It was only in the drawing-room, after tea, with young men on all sides of him, that he would commence work for himself." Yet with all his school engagements he found time to work at a Lexicon of Thucydides and at his edition of that author. In 1824 he studied the German language for the sake of reading Niebuhr's Rome, and then for the first time learned (what many others were still later in discovering) the depth and research of German literature. In 1825 he introduced Niebuhr to the English public in an article in the Quarterly Review, and by 1827 he had finished his able contributions to the Encyclopedia Metropolitana, on Roman History, from the time of the Gracchi to that of Trajan. He prepared, also, a sermon every week, a volume of which (the first of his series) was published in 1828. The following extracts from his letters in regard to this volume are so characteristic, that we must not omit them:—

"If the sermons are read, I do not care one farthing if the readers think me the most unclassical writer in the English language. I am not conscious of the *ex cathedrâ* tone of my sermons—at least not beyond what is proper for the pulpit, where one does in a manner speak *ex cathedrâ*."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 49.

In answer to a complaint, that the sermons "carried the standard so high as to unchristianize half the community," he says:—

"I do not see how the standard can be carried any higher than Christ or his apostles carry it, and I do not think that we ought to put it lower. I am sure that the habitually fixing it so much lower, especially in all our institutions and public practice, has been most mischievous."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 50.

In 1828 Dr. Arnold was placed in a more enlarged sphere of labor, as head master of Rugby School, and in the same year he was ordained priest, and took the degree of D. D. The situation

was in many respects a desirable one for him, and yet he had some misgivings, in view of the greatness of the task that would be devolved upon him,—and of the fact that he should have *to throw aside his old coats!*

"If I do get it, I feel as if I could set to work very heartily, and with God's blessing, I should like to try whether my notions of school education are really impracticable, whether our system of public schools has not in it some noble elements, which, under the blessing of the Spirit of all holiness and wisdom, might produce fruit even to life eternal. But when I think of the perfect vileness which I must daily contemplate, the certainty that this at best can be only partially remedied, the irksomeness of '*fortemque Gyan fortemque Cloanthum*,' and the greater form and publicity of the life which we should there lead, when I could no more bathe daily in the clear Thames, nor wear old coats and Russia duck-trowsers, nor hang on a gallows, nor climb a pole, I grieve to think of the possibility of a change."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 79.

To Rugby he went, preceded by a high reputation, which was founded more upon the representations of the eminent men with whom he had formed connections at Oxford, than upon any public acts of his own. Dr. Hawkins had assured the trustees, that if "Arnold went to Rugby he would change the character of the public schools all over England," and Dr. Hawkins knew his man. Arnold threw his whole life and soul at once into the school work. With characteristic independence, he had secured the entire control of the school before finally accepting the charge, and on commencing his duties, determined to do his duty, at all hazards, to shrink from no responsibility,—but to admit no *authority* into the school except his own. In short, he was, and meant to be, a complete dictator: and power was never intrusted to worthier hands. The reform of a great English public school, especially at that period, was a greater task than we, in this country, can possibly imagine: abuses, hoary with age, had so interwoven their ivy branches with the very walls of the establishment, that the attempt to pluck them away seemed likely to bring the whole fabric to the ground. But Arnold was not the man to cherish abuses because of their antiquity. The manner of instruction at Rugby did not suit him,—he changed it: the subjects taught were not in accordance with his views,—he substituted others: the discipline of the school had got to such a pass that expulsion was almost unknown,—and he adopted the principle, that "it is the first, second, and third duty of a schoolmaster to get rid of unpromising subjects." It was soon noised abroad that the head master of Rugby was a leveler and a destructive. The English country gentry had no other conception

of a public school than that it was a fit receptacle for troublesome sons,—a hospital to which they might send their leprous boys, and have them out of the way. And here, forsooth, was a schoolmaster, who, instead of keeping the criminals and "flogging their vices out of them," sent them back to their parents, with the pleasant assurance that Rugby was no place for such. It was too bad. And so from all quarters there were heard denunciations, loud and bitter, of the intractable and self-willed master: the trustees were assured that he would ruin the school; and he himself was beset on all sides, both by the persecutions of enemies and the fears of friends. But he had prepared himself for all this, and his inflexible purpose was maintained. His indomitable will prevailed; as such will, when it has right on its side, always must. The country gentlemen found that they had a *man* to deal with, in the Rugby schoolmaster, and soon gave him up: it was said, that a new era in education had begun there, and students flocked in faster than he wanted them: more than all, his untiring devotion to his work, the earnest spirit of religion which he infused into it, the uniform kindness of his manner, and the ardent youthfulness of his feelings, gained him the full affection of his pupils, and his victory was won. In a few years his place was secure; on whatever other grounds people might accuse him, as the head of a great school he was above calumny; and so he had his field fairly before him, and year after year he toiled in its cultivation, full of heart and hope. Fourteen years he spent at Rugby; and such years! quiet and peaceful in the calm repose of his home; ever active, yet still calm in the labors of the school; fiery and stirring in his ardent sympathies with the distresses of the time, and in his earnest battles with its vices and its crimes. As Whately says, "he was attached to his family as if he had no friends, to his friends as if he had no family, and to his country as if he had no friends or relations." He adopted heartily Bacon's maxim, that in this world "God only, and angels, can be spectators," and determined, that "whatever his hand found to do," he would "do it with his might." Of his school labors we shall speak more at large hereafter: amid them all he found time to work at his Thucydides, to lay out the ground for his Roman History, to prepare volume after volume of sermons, and to pour forth in newspapers, magazines, and reviews, his thronging thoughts on the political evils of the day. The interest he took in public affairs was such as can rarely be felt by men not actually engaged in political life: national sins and calamities pierced through and through his private domestic peace, and planted their arrows in his very heart. "I have a testimony to deliver, and must write or die," he

would say, when some of his *prudent* friends remonstrated with him for endangering (as they thought) his own popularity and the reputation of the school by his political writings: he would attack the evil as it rose,—believing that "the wisdom of winter" might become the "folly of spring." In 1829 he published a pamphlet on "the Christian Duty of conceding the Claims of the Roman Catholics," which made him many enemies, especially among the bigoted clergy of his own church, who would not believe in the honesty of any man who could see further than themselves. The first volume of his Thucydides appeared in 1830, the second and third in 1833 and 1835. Four volumes of sermons appeared between 1829 and 1842: and between 1838 and 1842, the three first volumes of the History of Rome, which was broken off, by his death, at the end of the second Punic war. Surely, this man believed, as he said, that work is the calling we are born for. Of his mode of life at this period, the following passage will give a good idea:—

"Perhaps the scene, which, to those who knew him best, would bring together the recollections of his public and private life in the most lively way, was his study at Rugby. There he sat at his work, with no attempt at seclusion, conversation going on around him—his children playing in the room—his frequent guests, whether friends or former pupils, coming in or out at will—ready at once to break off his occupations to answer a question, or to attend to the many interruptions to which he was liable; and from these interruptions he would return and recommence his writing as if it had not been broken off. 'Instead of feeling my head exhausted,' he would sometimes say after the day's business was over, 'it seems to have quite an eagerness to set to work. I feel as if I could dictate to twenty secretaries at once.' Yet he would often wish for something more like leisure and repose. It was from amidst this chaos of employments that he turned, with all the delight of which his nature was capable, to what he often dwelt upon as the rare, the unbroken, the almost awful happiness of his domestic life. It is impossible adequately to describe the union of the whole family around him who was not only the father and guide, but the elder brother and playfellow of his children—the gentleness and devotion which marked his whole feeling and manner in the privacy of his domestic intercourse. Those who had known him only in the school, can remember the surprise with which they first witnessed his tenderness and playfulness. The severity and the playfulness, expressing each in their turn the earnestness with which he entered into the business of life and the enjoyment with which he entered into its rest, were alike natural to him. There too were his hours of thorough relaxation, when he would throw off all thoughts of the school and of public matters—his quiet walks by the side of his wife's pony, when he would enter into the full enjoyment of air and exercise, and the outward

face of nature, observing with distinct pleasure each symptom of the burst of spring in the richness of summer—'feeling like a horse pawing the ground, impatient to be off, as if the very act of existence was an hourly pleasure to him.'"—*Life*, vol. i, pp. 211–213.

A beautiful picture of innocent happiness; and, what ineffably heightens its beauty, it was the happiness, not of a mere vegetable man, but of a great soul that was filled with great thoughts. We have seen the course of his daily life sufficiently from the above extract: it was almost monotonous in its regularity, varied only by his vacation residences at the quiet home which he had secured for himself at Fox How, or by the summer rambles over the continent, which must have been so congenial to his active mind, and furnished it with so much appropriate nutriment. He continued this course of life without external change, boldly attacking all abuses in church and state, battling with Conservatism, and Puseyism, and High-Churchism like a hero, stemming as great a tide of obloquy as ever was poured upon a private man in England, and at last, by sheer dint of force of character and talent, breaking down all prejudice, and taking a stand, such as he was justly entitled to hold, as one of the foremost men in the land. Satisfied as he was with his work at Rugby, he yet looked longingly for a wider sphere, and nowhere in England could that sphere be found for him except at Oxford, for which he had always cherished an almost overweening fondness. In 1842 his earnest hopes, or rather longings, were realized by his appointment to the Regius professorship of modern history, vacated by the death of Dr. Nares. Nor did the appointment occasion greater joy to himself than to the literary world of England generally; his great abilities, and especially his acquirements and capacities as a historian, were universally acknowledged; and men hoped that a new era would dawn upon the ancient university when he should commence his career there. Triumphantly indeed was it commenced, by an inaugural delivered before one of the largest audiences that had ever listened to a professor's voice in Oxford; and his introductory course of eight lectures* gave promise of a complete fulfillment of the strongest hopes, either of himself or his friends. Alas! alas! that the beginning should have been the end!

There were perhaps few happier men in England than Thomas Arnold, when he came back from Oxford in February, 1842, after the brilliant opening that he had made there. With new zeal he entered upon his school duties and upon his Roman History. His bodily health, with the exception of a slight indisposition in May

* Republished in this country by Messrs. Appleton.

of this year, had always been perfect; the brightest visions of his youthful ambition were in a fair way to become realities, and, more than all, the way to greater and more extended usefulness was opening wide before him. Let us now spend another day with him, at the close of his school term, Saturday, June 11. In the morning he was busily employed in examining the boys in Ranke's History of the Popes, and most of the day was spent in the business of the school, the distribution of prizes, and arrangements preparatory for the holidays. The last school exercise was, "*Domus Ultima:*" the last translation was from Spenser's "*Ruins of Time:*" the last words of his closing lecture on the New Testament were, "*It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.*" "So too," he said, "in the Corinthians, '*for now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face.*'" "Yes," he added, with marked fervency, "the mere contemplation of Christ shall transform us into his likeness." In the evening he took his usual stroll in the garden, and talked with a friend, remonstrating with him in regard to a tendency to Oxford errors, and closing his appeal with a fervent "God be praised, we *are* told the great mode by which we can be affected—we have his own blessed assurance, 'the words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.'" At supper the boys were struck with the cheerfulness and liveliness of his manner.

"One more act, the last before he retired that night, remains to be recorded,—the last entry in his Diary, which was not known or seen until the next morning, when it was discovered by those to whom every word bore a weight of meaning, which he who wrote it had but little anticipated.

"'Saturday evening, June 11. The day after to-morrow is my birthday, if I am permitted to live to see it—my forty-seventh birthday since my birth. How large a portion of my time on earth is already passed! And then—what is to follow this life? In one sense how nearly can I now say, "Vixi:" and I thank God that, as far as ambition is concerned, it is, I trust, fully mortified. I have no desire other than to step back from my present place in the world, and not to rise to a higher. Still, there are works which, with God's permission, I would do before the night cometh. But, above all, let me mind my own personal work,—to keep myself pure, and zealous, and believing,—laboring to do God's will, yet not anxious that it should be done by me rather than by others, if God disapproves of my doing it.'"—*Life*, vol. ii, p. 277.

Between five and six o'clock on Sunday morning, June 12th, he awoke with a sharp pain across his chest, but again composed himself to sleep: the fears of Mrs. Arnold, however, were awa-

kened, and she rose and called an old servant, who had long attended the sick bed of Dr. Arnold's sister. Returning to his room,—

"She observed him lying still, but with his hands clasped, his lips moving, and his eyes raised upward, as if engaged in prayer, when all at once he repeated, firmly and earnestly, 'And Jesus said unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen thou hast believed; blessed are they who have not seen, and yet have believed;' and soon afterward, with a solemnity of manner and depth of utterance which spoke more than the words themselves, 'But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.'

"From time to time he seemed to be in severe suffering; and on the entrance of the old servant before mentioned, said, 'Ah! Elizabeth, if I had been as much accustomed to pain as dear Susannah was, I should bear it better.' To his wife, however, he uttered no expressions of acute pain, dwelling only on the moments of comparative ease, and observing that he did not know what it was. But the more than usual earnestness which marked his tone and manner, especially in repeating the verses from Scripture, had again aroused her worst fears; and she ordered messengers to be sent for medical assistance, which he had at first requested her not to do, from not liking to disturb, at that early hour, the usual medical attendant, who had been suffering from indisposition.

"As the clock struck a quarter to seven, Dr. Bucknill (the son of the usual medical attendant) entered the room. He was then lying on his back—his countenance much as usual—his pulse, though regular, was very quick, and there was cold perspiration on the brow and cheeks. But his tone was cheerful. 'How is your father?' he asked on the physician's entrance: 'I am sorry to disturb you so early—I knew that your father was unwell, and that you had enough to do.' He described the pain, speaking of it as having been very severe, and then said, 'What is it?' While the physician was pausing for a moment before he replied, the pain returned, and remedies were applied till it passed away: and Mrs. Arnold seeing, by the measures used, that the medical man was himself alarmed, left the room for a few moments to call up her second son, the eldest of the family then at Rugby, and impart her anxiety to him; and during her absence her husband again asked what it was, and was answered that it was spasm of the heart. He exclaimed, in his peculiar manner of recognition, 'Ha!' and then on being asked if he had ever in his life fainted? 'No, never.' If he had ever difficulty of breathing? 'No, never.' If he ever had sharp pain in the chest? 'No, never.' If any of his family had ever had disease of the chest? 'Yes, my father had—he died of it.' What age was he? 'Fifty-three.' Was it suddenly fatal? 'Yes, suddenly fatal.' He then asked, 'If disease of the heart was a common disease?' 'Not very common.' 'Where do we find it most?' 'In large towns, I think.' 'Why?' (Two or three causes were mentioned.) 'Is it generally fatal?' 'Yes, I am afraid it is.'

"The physician then quitted the house for medicine, leaving Mrs.

Arnold, now fully aware, from him, of her husband's state. At this moment she was joined by her son, who entered the room with no serious apprehension, and, on his coming up to the bed, his father, with his usual gladness of expression toward him, asked, 'How is your deafness, my boy?' (he had been suffering from it the night before,)—and then, playfully alluding to an old accusation against him, 'you must not stay here; you know you do not like a sick room.' He then sat down with his mother at the foot of the bed, and presently his father said, in a low voice, 'My son, thank God for me;' and as his son did not at once catch his meaning, he went on, saying, 'Thank God, Tom, for giving me this pain: I have suffered so little pain in my life, that I feel it is very good for me: now God has given it to me, and I do so thank him for it.'

"Meanwhile his wife, who still had sounding in her ears the tone in which he had repeated the passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews, again turned to the Prayer-book, and began to read the exhortation, in which it occurs in 'the Visitation of the Sick.' He listened with deep attention, saying emphatically, 'Yes,' at the end of many sentences. 'There should be no greater comfort to Christian persons than to be made like unto Christ.' 'Yes.' 'By suffering patiently troubles, adversities, and sickness.' 'Yes.' 'He entered not into his glory before he was crucified.' 'Yes.'

"The physician now returned with the medicines, and the former remedies were applied: there was a slight return of the spasms, after which he said, 'If the pain is again as severe as it was before you came, I do not know how I can bear it.' He then, with his eyes fixed upon the physician, who rather felt than saw them upon him, so as to make impossible not to answer the exact truth, repeated one or two of his former questions about the cause of the disease, and ended by asking, 'Is it likely to return?' and, on being told that it was, 'Is it generally suddenly fatal?' 'Generally.'

"The physician, who was dropping the laudanum into a glass, turned round, and saw him looking quite calm, but with his eyes shut. In another minute he heard a rattle in the throat, and a convulsive struggle,—flew to the bed, caught his head upon his shoulder, and called to one of the servants to fetch Mrs. Arnold. She had just left the room before his last convulsion, with the physician, in order to acquaint her son with his father's danger, of which he was still unconscious, when she heard herself called from above. She rushed up stairs, told her son to bring the rest of the children, and with her own hands applied the remedies that were brought, in the hope of reviving animation, though herself feeling, from the moment she saw him, that he had already passed away. He was indeed no longer conscious. The sobs and cries of his children, as they entered and saw their father's state, made no impression upon him; the eyes were fixed; the countenance was unmoved; there was a heaving of the chest—deep gasps escaped at long intervals—and just as the usual medical attendant arrived, and as the old school-house servant, in an agony of grief, rushed with the others into the room, in the hope of seeing his master once more,—he breathed his last."—*Life*, vol. ii, pp. 278, 279.

The *religious* character of Dr. Arnold has been to some extent developed in the preceding pages. The world has rarely seen so noble a combination of intellectual power with humble piety; affections so ardent, consecrated to God; industry so indefatigable, laboring constantly for Christ; a will so indomitable, subdued entirely into the captivity of Christian obedience. His whole theory and practice of religion can be summed up in one word—CHRIST. He believed that "any man could make himself an atheist by breaking off his own personal communion with God in Christ." His faith seems to us to have been more powerful, to have seized upon the reality of Christ's life with a stronger grasp, than any man's that we have ever known. By it he daily *saw* the Invisible. "His rich mind filled up the naked outline of the gospel history; it was to him as *exciting* as any recent event in modern history of which the actual effects are visible." Hear how he prayed, and believe that his prayer was answered:—

"O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst take our nature upon thee, and art now standing as the Son of man at the right hand of the Majesty on high, reveal thyself to our minds and hearts, as thou didst to the bodily eyes of thy martyr Stephen: as thou didst comfort and strengthen him in his suffering, so, O Lord, do thou warn and chasten us in our enjoyments; making us to know and feel that in thee is our only life, and that if we cleave not to thee, and have not thee abiding in us, we are dead now, and shall be dead for ever."—*Life*, vol. ii, p. 311.

This abiding life of Christ in his own heart—this constant and immediate communion with him as the source of spiritual life, while it kept his own piety always active and ardent, fortified his mind against all forms of false doctrine, and gave additional intensity to the opposition which he waged against the Oxford heresy. His fundamental objection to the Newmanites was, that they "put Christ's church, and Christ's sacraments, and Christ's ministers, in the place of Christ himself." Nor yet, while he maintained the doctrine of justification by faith against all formalists and Romanists, did he fall into the error, too common we fear in these days, of resting his hopes for salvation upon his belief in that doctrine: on the contrary, he knew full well that a man may believe *in* justification, without the faith which justifies, and so he clung to Christ, and Christ alone, as the only Saviour of sinners; and justification with him was not a mere *doctrine*, but a *fact*. So indeed his whole religion was practical, rather than theoretical; life, rather than opinion; a matter of the heart, rather than the head. Although in many points like Paul, the unwearied, self-sacrificing, argumentative apostle, or even like Peter, ardent even to enthusiasm, and

bold even to rashness, he was still more like unto John, the beloved apostle, hanging about the person of Christ, resting upon his bosom, satisfied only in his presence, and breathing the very atmosphere of his love. And yet, what is most admirable, this lofty Christian character was so brought down to the necessities and weaknesses of every-day life, that it seemed impracticable to no man, however feeble in faith or humble in hope, who saw its constant development in Arnold's daily conduct. He was no saint, secluded from the world, exhaling his life away in pious visions in cell or cave,—abnegating all human sympathies and affections, and gaining a fancied elevation of superiority to earthly things—to be gazed at but not imitated: on the contrary, he was full to overflowing of kindly affections, sympathizing to excess with all human affairs, and working intensely in the ordinary labor of man's life. The great charm of Arnold's religious character consists in the rich harmony of high qualities which it presents. Endowed with a lofty intellect, which was the handmaid, rather than the enemy, of his faith, he never degenerated into rationalism; possessed of burning affections and an iron will, he never had even a tincture of fanaticism; severe against sin, as the enemy of God, and against error, as the prolific parent of sin, he yet dealt kindly, as his Master had done, with sinners, and held no man responsible for errors, unless deliberately imbibed and obstinately persisted in against the light of truth. Another marked feature was his determination to carry his religion everywhere, believing that it was intended by God that the church should be the salt of the earth. His school was to be a school of *Christian* young men; his Roman history was to be a Christian history; and, strange as it may seem to those good men who fear to enter the arena of political strife from fear of its contaminating atmosphere, his politics were Christian politics. In short, "he lived as seeing Him who is invisible," and sought to act, on all occasions, as if in the immediate presence of his Judge.

With such qualifications, Arnold could not but be a powerful and successful minister of Christ. But he had the additional qualification, which is far more rare, of a true insight into the design of God's revelation, and the use which men are to make of it. The Bible was for him no repository of speculative opinions, but a vast magazine of weapons from which the spiritual warrior must arm himself for the conflict with the powers of darkness. His views of the interpretation of Scripture were more far-reaching than those of any divine with whom we have become acquainted: on this subject, indeed, his thoughts were busy during his whole

life, and he considered the Essay which he wrote upon it* the most important and useful work that he had accomplished. He considered Scripture as a guide to us, not in its letter, but in its spirit: a guide, so far forth as we are circumstanced exactly like the persons to whom it was originally addressed. He deemed the "essence of the gospel revelation to consist in the views which it affords us of God's dealings and dispositions toward us, and of our consequent duties toward him:" and what he wanted in the interpretation of Scripture was, to "abstract from what is commonly called doctrine everything which is not of this kind; and, secondly, for what is of this kind, to present it only so far forth as it is so, dropping all deductions which we conceive may be drawn from it, regarded as naked truth, but which cannot be drawn from it, when regarded as a divine practical lesson." His object was not, according to the usual practice, to *use* the Scripture in order to establish certain religious opinions, but to study its contents themselves,—to end, instead of beginning, with doctrine. But the great peculiarity of Arnold's system of interpretation lay in his principle that "God's dealings with any particular generation of men are but the application of the eternal truths of his providence to their particular circumstances"—and that the *form* of that application is greatly varied. He would have considered, for instance, any attempt to justify polygamy, or slavery, or the wholesale slaughter of conquered nations, from the Old Testament, as absolutely turning the truth of God into a lie. He considered a man a heretic, not for holding this or that opinion, but for "doting about strifes of words," whether right or wrong. He considered the application of such passages as Titus iii, 10; 2 John 10, 11; or Jude 3, 19, 23, to the present differences of opinion among Christians as mere bigotry and a palpable perversion of the designs of Scripture. Illustrations of these principles may be found throughout his sermons, but especially in the volume placed third in order at the head of this article.

Thus qualified, by gifts, acquirements, and graces, to render faithful service as a minister of Christ, Dr. Arnold devoted himself to his calling unreservedly. Nor could any other branch of the ministerial work have called all his high powers more completely into requisition than the post to which he was called, at the head of a great school. We are sure that our readers will not find fault with us for dwelling at some length upon his character and labors in this, the great work of his life. He is said to have been the first man in England to raise the profession of a school-

* Attached to the second volume of Sermons.

master to its true dignity: and even in his case some men of the world thought that his powers were wasted in that office. "What a pity," said such, "that a man fit to be a statesman should be employed in teaching school-boys;" as if the teacher of school-boys did not make the statesman! As if the cure of souls, and of souls in that most trying period of their development, the dangerous days of youth—and the training of immortal beings to the stature of manhood, for which God made them,—as if *this* were not an occupation worthy of any intellect, however noble its gifts, however ample its acquirements! It saddens us to think how prevalent are low and unworthy views of the office of the teacher, even in our own country, where everything depends on its right fulfillment. Perhaps Arnold's noble example may stimulate many young minds to enter into this work with juster views of its grandeur and Christian elevation. Arnold must have been great and noble anywhere; but great and noble was he especially at the head of his three hundred scholars, every one of whom he watched anxiously, as the purchased of Christ. He felt that as a teacher he had "a mighty game to play, where the pawns were living creatures, and the adversary the devil." The following extract from a letter written just as he arrived at Rugby, and before he had entered upon his duties fully, will show how grave and lofty were his views of the work to which he had consecrated himself:—

"Next week will be the grand experiment; and I look to it naturally with great anxiety. I trust I feel how great and solemn a duty I have to fulfill, and that I shall be enabled to fulfill it by that help which can alone give the 'Spirit of power, and of love, and of a sound mind,' the three great requisites, I imagine, in a schoolmaster. You need not fear my reforming furiously: there I think I can assure you; but of my success in introducing a religious principle into education, I must be doubtful: it is my most earnest wish, and I pray God that it may be my constant labor and prayer; but to do this would be to succeed beyond all my hopes; it would be a happiness so great, that I think the world could yield me nothing comparable to it. To do it, however imperfectly, would far more than repay twenty years of labor and anxiety."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 226.

And again, speaking of the requisites of an assistant master:—

"The qualifications which I deem essential to the due performance of a master's duties here, may in brief be expressed as the spirit of a Christian and a gentleman,—that a man should enter upon his business not ἐκ παρέργου, but as a substantive and most important duty; that he should devote himself to it as the especial branch of the ministerial calling which he has chosen to follow; that, belonging to a great public institution, he should study things lovely and of good report;

and that he should have sufficient vigor of mind and thirst for knowledge to persist in adding to his own stores without neglecting the full improvement of those whom he is teaching."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 92.

To estimate the difficulty of the task which Arnold had before him, it must be recollected that when he commenced his duties at Rugby, the school had fallen so low, that an eminent man remarked "that he had gone to galvanize a dead jackass,"—that a general feeling of dissatisfaction with public schools prevailed in England at the time,—that classical studies were attacked with especial violence,—and, worse than all, men eminent both for piety and public station, such as Wilberforce, had raised their voices against the system, because of its really unchristian character. That these voices were not lifted up without cause is certain. Dr. Moberly, head master of Winchester School, writes, that when he went to the university, the tone of the young men there, whether they came from Eton, Winchester, Rugby, Harrow, or wherever else, was decidedly irreligious. "A religious undergraduate was very rare, very much laughed at when he appeared:" indeed, such were "hardly to be found at all among public-school men; or, if this be too strongly said, hardly to be found, except in cases where private and domestic training, or good dispositions, had prevailed over the school habits and tendencies." So deeply, indeed, was Arnold himself impressed with the dangers of public schools when free from the restraints of religion, that he unfolded, in one of his early sermons to his pupils, the cause which led good men to declare that "public schools are the seats and nurseries of vice," and, at a later period, set forth the evils by which he supposed that "great schools are likely to be corrupted, and to be changed from the likeness of God's people to that of a den of thieves." The chapter of the work before us, in which the methods and the spirit of Arnold's school government are set forth, is admirably clear and minute; but we can only indicate, in this place, its general features.

His whole management of the school was founded on the conviction, that what he had to look for, both intellectually and morally, was not *performance*, but *promise;* and that the very freedom of school life might be made the best preparation for Christian manhood. Perilous, indeed, he knew the probation to be; so perilous, that with his tender feelings he could never receive a new boy from the hands of his father without trembling; but this very perception of the dangers of the system only prepared him the more effectually to guard against them. But he believed also that the period of this dangerous probation, through which

every youth must pass, might be made shorter at a public school than elsewhere; and his constant anxiety was to shorten it, by instilling the principles of manly piety into the boy's mind as early as possible. He labored, therefore, not merely to check particular vices, but to create a feeling of abhorrence for evil, as such. "I always think," said he, "of the psalm, 'Neither doth he abhor anything which is evil.'"

"Among all the causes which in his judgment contributed to the absence of this feeling, and to the moral childishness which he considered the great curse of public schools, the chief seemed to him to lie in the spirit which was there encouraged of combination, of companionship, of excessive deference to the public opinion prevalent in the school. Peculiarly repugnant as this spirit was at once to his own reverence for lawful authority, and to his dislike of servile submission to unlawful authority; fatal as he deemed it to all approach to sympathy between himself and his scholars; to all free and manly feeling in individual boys; to all real and permanent improvement of the institution itself; it gave him more pain when brought permanently before him, than any other evil in the school. At the very sight of a knot of vicious or careless boys gathered together round the great school-house fire, 'it makes me think,' he would say, 'that I see the devil in the midst of them.' From first to last it was the great subject to which all his anxiety converged. No half year ever passed without his preaching upon it; he turned it over and over in every possible point of view; he dwelt on it as the one master fault of all. 'If the spirit of Elijah were to stand in the midst of us, and we were to ask him, "What shall we do then?" his answer would be, "Fear not, nor heed another's voice, but fear and heed the voice of God only."'"—*Life*, vol. i, p. 103.

In the system of school instruction itself there was nothing peculiar: all depended upon the principles on which the instruction was given, and the impulses which his own example afforded. Even the ordinary instruction given to the classes was invested with the same sense of moral responsibility as the exercises more directly religious. Mere talent was not so respectable in his eyes as mediocrity combined with conscientious industry. On one occasion he had spoken somewhat sharply to a dull pupil, when the boy looked up in his face and said, "Why do you speak angrily, sir?—indeed, I am doing the best that I can." Years afterward he used to tell the story to his children, and say, "I never felt so much ashamed in my life—that look and that speech I have never forgotten." To all *cramming* he was a deadly foe: his object was rather to awaken the minds of boys than to load them with information which they could not digest. "You came here," he would say, "not to read, but to learn how to read:"—and both in

their translations from ancient authors, and in their original compositions, he strove to bring out their own powers: and for this end their subjects were so selected as to oblige them to read and think for themselves. "I call that the best theme," he said, "which shows that the boy has read and thought for himself; that, the next best, which shows that he has read several books, and digested what he has read; and that, the worst, which shows that he has followed but one book, and followed that without reflection."

Besides the incidental religious instruction which he imparted in the course of the regular recitations, he made the Scripture lessons a vehicle of more direct teaching. A deep impression was made upon the minds of the boys by the mere spectacle of a man, whose greatness seemed to them almost awful, treating the Scriptures with so deep a sense of reverence as Arnold always displayed for them. "He appeared to me," writes a pupil, whose intercourse with him never extended beyond these lessons, "to be remarkable for his habit of realizing everything that we are told in Scripture. You know how frequently we can ourselves, and how constantly we hear others, go prosing on in a sort of religious cant or slang, which is as easy to learn as any other technical jargon, without seeing, as it were, by that faculty which all possess of picturing to the mind, and acting as if we really *saw* things unseen, belonging to another world. Now, he seemed to have the freshest view of our Lord's life and death that I ever knew a man to possess."

It was in the school chapel that Arnold's greatest power over his pupils was gained. Before his time, the school had a separate chaplain, and preaching to the pupils had never been deemed an essential part of the head master's office. But with such views of the office as he held, such an arrangement could not last; and, accordingly, in 1831, he asked for, and obtained the chaplaincy, without additional salary, and from that period to the end of his life he preached regularly on every Sunday afternoon. And such sermons! so clear, so pointed, so full of the very warnings and instructions that his audience demanded; so affectionate, yet so severe; so mild, yet so decided:—and yet we are told that they were written always between the morning and afternoon service, and that he preached them while the ink was hardly dry! A volume of the school sermons has been republished in this country: would that *such* sermons could be preached on every Sunday in every school and college in the land!

"But more than either the matter or manner of his preaching, was the impression of himself. Even the mere readers of his sermons will derive from them the history of his whole mind, and of his whole

management of the school. But to his hearers it was more than this. It was the man himself, there, more than in any other place, concentrating all his various faculties and feelings on one sole object, combating face to face the evil with which, directly or indirectly, he was elsewhere perpetually struggling. . . . It is difficult to describe, without seeming to exaggerate, the attention with which he was heard by all above the very young boys. Years have passed away, and many of his pupils can look back to hardly any greater interest than that, with which, for those twenty minutes, Sunday after Sunday, they sat beneath that pulpit, with their eyes fixed upon him, and their attention strained to the utmost to catch every word that he uttered."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 151.

We should delight to dwell longer on Dr. Arnold as a schoolmaster, and to quote some of the many anecdotes with which the biography abounds, illustrative of his affectionate interest in the boys, and kind, familiar intercourse with them; but our limits warn us to bring our article to a close. No wonder that he gained the hearts of his pupils: no wonder that the university should soon feel the influence of the Rugby men; and that religious undergraduates should have become as common at Oxford as they were rare before Arnold's time. And no wonder, that before his death, it was known all over England that Rugby was a Christian school, and that the happy contagion spread to many other of the large seminaries. God prospered the work of the good man's hands.

A few words, now, upon the great features of Dr. Arnold's character, as they developed themselves not only in the school, but in his writings, his politics, and, in short, in his whole life. Of his gentleness, his ardent affections, his enthusiasm, his humility, and his industry, the preceding pages speak: but there is one great characteristic, so strongly marked as to put all the others in the shade, to which we wish to direct the special attention of our readers, namely, the thorough *love of truth*, without regard to consequences, which was the guiding principle of all his opinions and actions.

The majesty of such love of truth consists in its being a conquest of human passions. The mere preference of truth to error, as such, is not so wonderful:—it is the natural tendency of the human understanding, which cannot love error for its own sake, which cannot rest in anything but truth, if the play of its faculties be undisturbed by opposing or distracting forces. But the actual world in which we live is full of such forces. The needle is true to the pole, only when there is no disturbing attraction to deflect it: in man, the love of self, developing itself in ambition, in avarice, in lust, in indolence, is stronger than the love of truth. All these must be subdued before she can occupy her rightful throne of

supremacy in the soul; and mighty men alone achieve such victories. It is for this reason, that the heart worshipers of truth have been so few in the world. In all time there have been, as there are now, brawlers, and partisans, and controversialists, enough, on all sides, of all possible opinions, all proclaiming their supreme devotion to the truth; and all ready to fight for it, weep for it, pray for it, suffer for it, live for it, die for it,—anything but *love* it. Why? Because, in doing all these brave and noisy things, men can gratify their own passions, while in loving the *truth* they must crush them. The real follower of truth takes the wreath from his own brow to bind it upon hers; the man who only acts the hero for her, expects her glory to be reflected upon her champion, and would pluck the noblest garland of praise from her shrine to crown his own forehead withal. So, the question is not, with most men, in regard to any doctrine, "Is this true?" but, "Does it accord with my system? will it advance my sect? will it please my party? will it strengthen my reputation?"—or, as Carlyle says of Voltaire,—"'Can others be convinced of this? can I truck it in the market for power?' To such questioners, truth, who buys not and sells not, goes on her way and makes no answer."

The man who conquers these passions, who gets above the prejudices of his time, who emerges from the Cave* or the Den, whose ears are not stunned by the babbling of men's tongues in the Forum, whose eyes are not dazzled by the shifting lights of the Theatre, is, as we have said, a mighty man. Strong indeed he must be, to achieve such a conquest, and stronger, immeasurably, does the conquest make him. To such a man, CHRIST has promised that "he shall know the truth, and the truth shall make him free:" such a man, "resting and assuring himself upon God's protection and favor, gathereth a force and faith which human nature itself could never attain."† These, then, *freedom and power*, are the gifts, great and precious, which the earnest love of truth brings to her votary. The bonds which fetter the limbs of others, he breaks, as did Samson the green withes of the Philistines: the hollow conventionalities which enslave and palsy the minds of ordinary men, are but gossamer to him: the many-tongued voice of popular hate, or of popular applause, falls unheeded on his ear: he is ever free and strong. His name may, and probably will, be cast out as evil; his very virtues may be stigmatized as crimes; his ardor may be called imprudence, his firmness obstinacy, his boldness temerity: he may, and probably will, make enemies on the

* Bacon—Idola Specus, Tribus, Fori, Theatri. † Bacon, Essay on Atheism.

right hand and on the left, and bring upon himself sorrow, reproach, and suffering; but none of these things move him:—

> Through all changes and all chances, he undaunted still advances,
> Lord alike of success and disaster;

for he knows, that whatever becomes of himself, the cause for which he lives, the truth for which he toils, must and will finally triumph. In this class of great men Thomas Arnold must be enrolled. If there was one feature that characterized him more strongly than all others, it was his earnest love of truth, and his fearless honesty in proclaiming it. We shall allude to a few points in his history illustrating this assertion.

Consistent, then, in the first place, with this great characteristic of earnest truthfulness, was his advocacy of *private judgment* as the right, nay, as the duty, of every Christian man. His faith in Christianity was complete, but it was not gained by the surrender or the sacrifice of his mental powers. He held no opinions on which he feared the fullest light of day to fall. "Faith, without reason," says he, "is not properly faith, but mere power worship; and power worship may be devil worship."

"There is no end to the mischiefs done by that one very common and perfectly unscriptural mistake of opposing faith and reason, or whatever you choose to call the highest part of man's nature. And this you will find that the Scripture never does: and observing this, cuts down at once all Pusey's nonsense about rationalism: which, in order to be contrasted scripturally with faith, must mean the following some lower part of our nature, whether sensual or merely intellectual; that is, some part which does not acknowledge God. But what he abuses as rationalism is just what the Scripture commends as knowledge; and to this is opposed, in Scriptural language, folly, and idolatry, and blindness, and other such terms of reproof. According to Pusey, the forty-fourth chapter of Isaiah is rationalism, and the man who bowed down to the stock of a tree was an humble man, who did not inquire, but believe. But if Isaiah be right, and speaks the word of God, then Pusey, and the man who bowed down to the stock of a tree, should learn that God is not served by folly."—*Life*, vol. ii, p. 52.

Nor did he hold this theory merely for himself, and require others to renounce their own judgment in favor of his. Even in the school, he always desired his pupils to form their opinions for themselves, and not take them in trust from him. "It would be a great mistake," he would say, "if I were to try to make myself here into a pope."

Consistent, also, with this honesty of heart, was his preference for the comprehensiveness of Bible truth, rather than for fixed sys-

tems, creeds, and formulas; and, as a necessary consequence, the liberal and catholic feelings with which he regarded all branches of the Christian church. Whoever were on Christ's side were on his: the bigotry which seems to be the second nature of so many Church of England preachers was a stranger to his bosom. Unlike them, and their pitiful imitators in this country, he could enter without fear into a Presbyterian church; (and *call* it a church, too;) could find "the singing of the congregation" delightful, and could be edified by the prayers, though they were not to be found in the book. Every man who preached the gospel of Christ in its purity was in the apostolical succession for him. More strongly still was this love of truth, victorious over all prejudices of education, place, and connections, displayed in his writings upon the Church of England. We have before spoken of his article in the Edinburgh, for 1826; and of his Essay on Church Reform, in 1833; both of which must have sounded like the voice of doom in the ears of the slumbering drones that infest and curse the Establishment. It was bold, indeed, in a young clergyman of the Church of England to expose the "parrot-like" phrases, of which the lovers of old abuses are so fond, such as, "the venerable Establishment;" "the heroic martyrs of the church;" "the mild and tolerant spirit of its doctrines and ministers:" bold, indeed, to speak of "the constitution in church and state," as being like "the feet of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which were made part of iron and part of miry clay,—the church [the clay part] patched up in a hurry three hundred years ago, out of elements confessedly corrupted, and ever since allowed to subsist, unlooked to and unmended, as if, like the water of the Thames, it would grow pure by the mere lapse of time." In short, he did not hesitate to call it a "corrupt system, which in many points stands just where it did in the worst days of Popery, only reading 'king' or 'aristocracy' in the place of pope." And this, too, while he loved the church most ardently, and was himself, with all his interests, bound up in her welfare; was himself one of her ministers, and had to break through the *esprit du corps* completely, before he could open his mouth.

With such views and feelings, it was in entire harmony with his leading principles to throw the whole weight of his character and influence against the Oxford heresy. Let it be remembered that the men who were engaged in this attempt to carry the Church of England back to the embraces of Rome were eminent for their ability; that they had risen up in the same college in which Arnold had lived; that for one of them, at least, he cherished an affectionate regard; that their views were put forth under the guise of great

love for the church, and great enmity to Rome; that the highest dignitaries of the church seemed afraid, at first, to censure the movement, while some of them, not very indirectly, gave it their countenance;—and Arnold's honest boldness will appear in strong relief. Nor did he, like many others, stop at half measures;—he went at once to the root of the matter. He saw through the utter falseness and emptiness of the claim of apostolical succession, as every right-minded man must, who knows anything of church history;—and he was too good a logician not to see that if this claim were admitted, all the rest might as well be yielded at once. The Tractarians commenced their labors by giving forcible expositions of the moral and social evils of England: evils whose malignant presence Arnold keenly felt and earnestly deplored; and he was, therefore, the more indignant when he found that the only panacea which they had to offer was the apostolical succession,—that to the millions who were crying for bread they had nothing to offer but a stone.

"My quarrel with Newman and with the Romanists, and with the dominant party in the church up to Cyprian,—and all that I have named are exactly in the same boat,—is, that they have put a false church in the place of the true, and through their counterfeit have destroyed the reality, as paper money drives away gold. And this false church is the priesthood, to which are ascribed all the powers really belonging to the true church, with others which do not and cannot belong to any human power. But the priesthood and the succession are inseparable,—the succession having no meaning whatever, if there be not a priesthood. It has always vexed me to see the clergy coqueting as they do with the doctrine of succession, and clinging to it, even while they stoutly repudiate all those notions of the priesthood which the succession doctrine really involves in it."—*Life* vol. i, p. 229.

Here is a passage which we recommend to the notice of our "evangelical" brethren of the Episcopal denomination in this country:—

"It is by this handle that the Newmanites have gained such ground, especially with the evangelicals,—for they, too, have been fond of the succession notion, and when the doctrine has been pressed to its consequences, they have, in many instances, embraced them, however repugnant to their former general views of doctrine."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 233.

Arnold could no more find the church system, or rather the priest system, in Scripture, than he could the worship of Jupiter. He deemed it absurd to hold the apostolical succession,—the corner-stone of priestcraft, and therefore of Popery,—short of Romanism. So too, he believed that tradition, as an authoritative interpreter of

Scripture, is not only valueless, but absolutely destructive to all genuine interpretation: and that "church authority, whether early or late, is as rotten a staff as ever was Pharaoh's,—it will go into a man's hand to pierce him. I am as well satisfied that if you let in but one little finger of tradition you will have in the whole monster, horns, and tail, and all."

Now, we think that Arnold's course on this subject was an exhibition of honest boldness such as the world rarely sees. One man, and one only, holding a high station in the Church of England, has ventured to go so far as he; and the name of RICHARD WHATELY is held in honor among all men who can appreciate whatever is noble or lofty in our human nature. But what Episcopal preacher of any eminence in this country, whether high-church or low-church, would venture to hold such opinions as these,—or, holding them, to avow them? Puseyism, indeed, they will assail, but who among them will attack that which gave Puseyism its vantage-ground—the apostolical succession? We have yet to see the man, of the present generation, bold enough for this.

Consistently, too, with his earnest truthfulness of character, Dr. Arnold was no *party-man*, either in church or state. Although his sympathies were always with the people and his votes were generally given to the whigs, neither of the great rival parties of the day could claim him as their own, and both regarded him as a "crotchety" man, full of notions of his own, and entirely too stiff to be useful in a day of strife. "If I had two necks," says he, "I should think that I had a very good chance of being hanged by both sides."

"Be of one party to the death, and that is CHRIST's; but abhor every other: abhor it, that is, as a thing to which to join yourselves; for every party is mixed up of good and evil, of truth and falsehood; and in joining it, therefore, you join with the one as well as the other. If circumstances should occur which oblige you practically to act with any one party, join it with a sad and reluctant heart; for it is in Christ's cause only that we can act with heart and soul, as well as patiently and triumphantly suffer. Do this amidst reproach, and suspicion, and cold friendship, and zealous enmity; for this is the portion of those who seek to follow their Master and him only. Do it, although your foes be of your own household; those whom nature, or habit, or choice, had once bound to you most closely. And then you will understand how, even now, there is a daily cross to be taken up by those who seek not to praise men, but God; yet you will learn no less, how that cross, meekly and firmly borne, whether it be the cross of men's ill opinion from without, or of our own evil nature struggled against within, is now, as ever, peace, and wisdom, and sanctification, and redemption, through Him who first bore it."—*Sermons*, vol. iii, p. 263.

It is clear, then, that he opposed the spirit of party, not from any fear of the embarrassments into which it might lead him,—for his earnest resistance cost him greater sacrifices than yielding would have done,—but because he hated it, as the foe of truth and good But while he sedulously kept himself free from all entangling political alliances, there was no concealment of his real political opinions; all England knew him as the great enemy of toryism. His political doctrines might be summed up in one word—PROGRESS. "It boots not to look back," said he,—"Forward, forward, forward, should ever be our motto." He had cast off utterly that prejudice of antiquity which binds so many strong minds as with fetters of iron. And well he might, for this prejudice has cost mankind more wretchedness and suffering, and has hindered the progress of right, and truth, and happiness, more, perhaps, than all other causes put together. It is true that a just respect for antiquity finds support in the best principles of our nature. It is just, to a certain extent, that we should regard that which has triumphed over time, as containing within itself the seeds of immortality. But there is a limit to the application of this just reverence, beyond which it becomes a blinding prejudice. To the man who has gone beyond this limit, hoary error is more venerable than recent truth. He would rather err with former ages than be right with the present. Such a man is your thorough *conservative*,—a man who would rather dwell in the old tottering edifice until the winds batter it down about his ears, than live in peace and comfort under one built on new-fangled principles of political architecture. In religion, he thinks that the old times were better than the present; and, although the church, with all her faults, is purer and more energetic now than she has been at any former period in the history of Christianity, he is perpetually groaning over departures from old standards, and predicting that the love of change will one day sweep off all that is lovely and of good report from the face of the earth. The spirit of progress is not in him. His face is not turned toward the future in hope, but toward the past in sadness. Instead of the true, this man loves the old; and change, of whatever sort, he resists, simply because it *is* change. This spirit—the spirit of "letting well enough alone"—Dr. Arnold considered to be, next to priestcraft, the greatest evil with which mankind have been afflicted. "Conservatism," in his mouth, "was not merely the watchword of an English party, but the symbol of an evil against which his whole public life was one continued struggle, and which he dreaded in his own heart not less than in the institutions of his country."* "I have prayed that,

* Life, vol. i, p. 181.

with God's blessing, no excesses of popular wickedness, though I should be myself, as I expect, the victim of them; no temporary evils produced by revolution, shall ever make me forget the wickedness of toryism,—of that spirit which has, throughout the long experience of all history, continually thwarted the cause of God and goodness." The following passages are as pregnant with wisdom as they are alive with earnestness:—

"It seems to me that the real parties in human nature are the conservatives and the advancers; those who look to the past or present, and those who look to the future, whether knowingly and deliberately, or by an instinct of their nature, indolent in one case and restless in the other, which they themselves do not analyze. Thus, conservatism may sometimes be ultra democracy, sometimes aristocracy, as in the civil wars of Rome, or in the English constitution now; and the advance may be sometimes despotism, sometimes aristocracy, but always keeping its essential character of advance, of taking off bonds, removing prejudices, altering what is existing. The advance in its perfect form is Christianity, and in a corrupted world must always be the true principle, although it has in many instances been so clogged with evil of various kinds, that the conservative principle, though essentially false since man fell into sin, has yet commended itself to good men while they looked on the history of mankind only partially, and did not consider it as a whole. . . . . I myself am conservative in all my instincts, and am only otherwise by an effort of my reason or principle, as one overcomes all one's other bad propensities. I think conservatism far worse than toryism, if by toryism be meant a fondness for monarchical or even despotic government: for despotism may often further the advance of a nation, and a good dictatorship may be a very excellent thing, as I believe of Louis Philippe's government at this moment, thinking Guizot to be a great and good man who is looking steadily forward: but conservatism always looks backward and never forward, and therefore, under whatever form of government, I think it the enemy of all good."—*Life*, vol. i, p. 396, vol. ii, p. 19.

One other lesson the Life of Dr. Arnold teaches with great emphasis, namely, that the man who devotes himself earnestly to the good of his race, and pursues a straightforward course of truthful honesty, will, in the long run, however he may be slandered and proscribed for a time, reap the surest reward, not merely in the conscious gladness which the fearless performance of duty always brings with it, but in the applause of all whose good opinion is worth possessing. In his lifetime he was opposed and suspected by men of every party: high-churchmen denounced him as a latitudinarian and a rationalist; low-churchmen as leaning toward Rome; the tories deemed him a restless and unprincipled Jacobin; and the liberals as a stern and unbending church-and-state man;

and even his friends, for many years, considered his course as rash, ill-considered, and imprudent. Yet, one by one, the very measures which, when he first broached them, startled all men by their unspeakable boldness, took their place as accomplished facts; one by one his adversaries fell off; and at last, even before he died, he came to be looked up to, by the people of England, as a great leader in the cause of truth and freedom. And now that he is gone, a universal chorus of praise and admiration of his virtues rises up from men of all opinions; and all sects are uniting their contributions to erect a fitting memorial over his grave.

There are many of Dr. Arnold's opinions with which we have no sympathy. His theory of a "Christian state" we consider to be the fond dream of a noble mind; and have not thought it necessary to give any detail of it in this article. But of the spread of his writings we entertain no fear: for the diffusion of his spirit we pray most ardently and earnestly. On a fitting occasion we hope hereafter to give a more extended notice to some of the works placed at the head of this article, especially of the History of Rome and the Lectures on Modern History: in the mean time we advise our readers to read the Life, assured, if they do this, that they will need no urging to become familiar with all the works of Thomas Arnold.

Carlisle, February 1, 1846.

Art. VII.—1. *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.* Second Edition, from the third London Edition, greatly amended by the Author, and an Introduction by Rev. George B. Cheever, D. D. New-York: Wiley & Putnam. 1845.

2. *Explanations: a Sequel to "Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation."* By the Author of that Work. New-York: Wiley & Putnam. 1846.

The first of these books contains an ingenious attempt to explain the formation of the world, and the production of the creatures which inhabit it, by the operation of mechanical and chemical laws; and ends with the logical consequences of such an hypothesis, a material psychology, and a sensual theory of morals. The author endeavors to mask his atheism by professing to admit God as the creator and legislator of the primordial matter, but denies

him any direct agency in the subsequent work of creation, and in the government of mundane affairs. His Sequel is an elaborate but unsuccessful defense of his system of nature against the assaults of his reviewers, and a protest against the competency of the scientific class to decide upon the truth of speculations founded upon scientific data.

The author informs us that he "has thought that the time was come for attempting to weave a great generalization out of the [physical] truths already established, *or likely soon to be so.*" Now we shall be the last to deny that many truths do still lie concealed in the domains of science; but what, we would ask, does this writer know of these hidden truths, that he requires us to yield our assent to a bold induction from them—an induction which banishes God from his own universe, makes man an electro-chemical machine, annihilates all moral distinctions, and destroys the most consolatory of human hopes? Coming truths do indeed often cast their shadows a long distance before them; but the shadows are almost always so ill-defined, that we can form no safe judgment of the nature of the realities which produce them. No man, whose intellect has been trained in the severe school of the inductive method, would dare to use them either as the warp or woof of a "great generalization." Established truths are solid and unyielding; they have form, consistency, and cohesiveness, and cannot be stretched and mutilated to suit the Procrustean bed of any and every hypothesis. But fancied truths are elastic and pliable as the imagination which conceives them; they can be compressed or expanded to any required dimensions, and distorted to any desirable shape. They are like venal oracles, whose responses never fail to conform to the wishes of him who consults them. A generalization, in whose texture such accommodating materials are combined with established truths, like a web in which warp of iron is filled with woof of gossamer, must fall to pieces with the slightest shock. Yet just such a web has our author woven, from beginning to end.

With a scope so unlimited, the author ought at least to have constructed a system logically consistent in all its parts. But he has not done this. His materialism is indeed consistent with itself throughout; but on this trunk of materialism he has ingrafted branches from a stock of a different order, which can draw no life from its root, and which wither and die when fed by its poisonous sap. The wholesome fruits of the tree of life ripen not upon the fell Cicuta. He has mingled together incompatible doctrines, and vainly sought, by an alchemy peculiarly his own, to fuse them into

a unity of precious gold. Systems of belief the most heterogeneous and contradictory, which never looked each other in the face except in deadly hostility, are huddled together, cheek by jowl, in his book, as if by proximity alone they could be made to shake hands, and forget all past animosities. He professes much reverence for a sort of Deity, to whom he acknowledges no allegiance, and owes no duty; and from whom he expects no protection, hopes no reward, and fears no punishment. He pretends to believe the Bible; and yet discards its light, stultifies its revelations, and builds up a scheme of nature which is abhorrent to its teachings. He honors man; yet claims a pair of monkeys as his progenitors. He loves virtue; yet offers no inducement to practice it, except present gratification or tranquillity. He hates vice; yet can perceive no other than organic differences between the vicious and the virtuous. He explains creation without a creator, the origin of organic life from the forces of inorganic matter, and the spontaneous transmutation of species by a law of universal development; yet sees evidences of design in creation, and believes in final causes. He talks about God as a supreme cause; yet admits no efficient cause but law, and no basis of law but matter. He alledges that mind and electricity are identical, that the brain is a galvanic battery, and that all mental phenomena depend on certain conditions of matter; yet he imagines it possible that something may be in reserve for man "behind the screen of nature." He admits that God is ever present in all things; yet thinks that it would be a wearisome task for him "to be constantly moving from one sphere to another, to form and plant the various species which may be required in each situation at particular times." He denies that God exercises "an immediately superintending power over the mundane economy;" yet feels assured that "benevolence is a leading principle of the divine Mind." He seems to suppose that the most rational conception which we can form of God is that of a being who reposes "in silent contemplation of his works, unoffended by evil, pitiless of suffering, satisfied with one eternal round of such doings as we see exemplified upon earth;" and then shrinking back, as if by a revulsion of his better nature, from the isolated sternness of so chilling an idea, which he confesses that the majority of mankind can never be persuaded to believe, he recognizes "moral emotions and doings as a means of rising to and communing with God."

When Geoffroy St. Hilaire promulged his *Theory of Analogues*,*

* See Whewell's History of Inductive Sciences, vol. iii, p. 457.

to which, by the way, our author is largely indebted, he said, "I take care not to ascribe to God any intention." He proposed to study the structure and functions of animals in their resemblances to other organizations, by which they are gradually derived from the original type, and without any reference to final causes. And when Cuvier speaks of the consistency of the organs with the part which the animal has to play in nature, Geoffroy replies, "I know nothing of animals which have to play a part in nature."* This was honest and bold. The French naturalist saw the logical results of his theory, and did not shrink from avowing them. He had at least the merit of consistency. But the author of the Vestiges, fearful that his conclusions may alarm his readers, drags in his passive Deity, whenever he wishes to close a chapter with an eloquent flourish, or to lull the apprehensions which weak minds, forsooth, may feel, at the startling nature of certain hypotheses, founded on assumptions of unusual hardihood. With all the beauty and apparent sincerity of these passages, we are unable to divest them of a literal meaning somewhat like the following:—"Be not alarmed, neophyte of nature's mysteries; the dose is quite harmless. Swallow it, and make no wry faces. Behold what copious draughts I myself have taken, and yet mark what a healthful theist I am, and how pious a man!" This writer is not the first of his school who has commended to the unwary a poisoned cup with a honeyed brim. It has been an approved artifice of atheistic strategy ever since Epicurus set the example. A stronghold, impregnable to assault, may be taken by mining; and the author's admissions in regard to a Deity are put forth with no other aim than to mask his subterranean approaches to the citadel of his reader's faith. If he can convince men that God's part of the work of creation terminated with the single act of calling matter and its laws into being, he knows, or ought to know, that then their minds will have been brought to a point from which there is but a hair's breadth to atheism on one side, and material pantheism on the other. It is not more difficult to conceive uncreated matter than uncreated spirit. Why then should God exist for no purpose but to cause the existence of that which could have existed eternally as easily as himself? There is then no God, or matter is God. By a similar step the atheism of Anaximander was a natural offshoot from the dualism of Thales. The founder of the Ionic school assumed an uncreated Intelligence and uncreated matter. His disciple repudiated the notion of God, as unnecessary to an expla-

* See Whewell's History of Inductive Sciences, vol. iii, pp. 461, 462.

nation of the world, and proceeded to frame a cosmology purely material.*

But while this writer's admissions of God, revelation, and final causes, may gain him a courteous reception and a gracious audience with many who would shut their doors in his face if he appeared in his real character, they at the same time expose him to a mode of attack from which he might have escaped by imitating the honesty of Geoffroy. He presents an unprotected flank to the entire battery of arguments which can be drawn from the Bible, and from the existence of an Intelligent Cause and a Benevolent Contriver;—a battery which can sweep off his array at the first discharge. We shall, however, leave the weapons of the theological armory for the use of the doctors of divinity, and especially of Dr. Cheever, whose Introduction to this book proves that he can wield them well. But that class of men, to whose minds Dr. Cheever's arguments would address themselves with decisive force, is not the class to which the book will do serious mischief. There is another, and, we fear, a more numerous class, whose faith in divine revelation is not settled and firm, and who will conclude, that if the author has erected his edifice on the truths of nature, we may well hesitate to believe the Bible, for nature and the Bible tell different stories. Both cannot be true, and nature cannot be false. The writer has also displayed great ingenuity in arranging the proofs of his materialism, and has made out a case, which, on the surface, looks extremely plausible. His book is well calculated to bewilder even right-minded persons, who have not enough of scientific knowledge to expose its assumptions, and detect its fallacies. It becomes necessary, therefore, to meet him on his own ground, and to show that though nature cannot be false, she may find, and has found, a false interpreter. It is not our purpose, however, to follow out the details of his argument, for this would require a volume larger than his own. Nor is this necessary; for the whole entablature of his scheme of nature rests upon three columns, and if we can remove the pedestals of these, the superstructure will tumble about his ears. The supports of his grand *law-creation* are three hypotheses, which we may call his cosmogony, zoogony, and zoonomy; or, in more popular terms, his nebular hypothesis, his hypothesis of the origin of organic life by spontaneous generation, and his hypothesis of the gradual development of the various species of plants and animals by the transmutation of the lower into the higher.

Before entering upon the discussion of these points, we beg the

* History of Philosophy, vol. i, pp. 101–103.

reader to recollect that the case is one in which the *onus probandi* rests upon the party that brings it into court. He must produce his witnesses and his stone records, prove his facts, and make out his hypothesis, not as *possibly* true, but as *true*, or at least *probably* true. We are not required, as counsel for the defense, to prove anything whatever. If we can satisfy the jury that his witnesses have given false testimony, and that he has put erroneous constructions upon the language of the documents admitted in evidence, in matters of vital importance to his case, his hypothesis falls to the ground, and we claim a verdict in our favor. Let us now examine the three main points on which the decision of the question depends.

1. *Cosmogony.* The primordial matter was "a universal firemist," which, by some change in the condition of its heat, separated into nebulæ. A nucleus, formed at or near the centre of a nebula, was the next step toward the integration of these fiery infinitesimals into a system with a single sun, while two or three nuclei in the same nebula would result in a binary or ternary system. Our solar system is a type of the others, and a dynamical theory of its development will explain the formation of all. A nucleus, then, being formed at the point which is now the sun's centre, the nebulous matter flowed toward it in obedience to the law of gravitation, and the confluence of opposing currents produced a rotatory motion. The velocity of rotation was accelerated as the radius of the contracting mass diminished, and the increasing centrifugal force flattened the revolving spheroid, till the equatorial parts began to solidify by refrigeration into a crust, which the continued contraction of the interior fluid at length detached from its mass. This ring, not being of uniform structure, was next broken into several fragments, the largest of which attracted the rest to itself, and taking the spherical form, revolved around the central mass with a velocity equal to the rotation of that mass at the moment of its detachment. By these throes of parturition the planet Uranus became the eldest born of our nebulous mother, and after a similar gestation, it in turn gave birth to satellites. In like manner the central body threw off Saturn, Jupiter, and the younger children of the family in succession. But by some mishap the fragments of the ring between Mars and Jupiter, instead of collecting, as was intended, into a goodly member of the fraternity, gathered into four dwarfs;* thus illustrating, on a large scale, the mystery of *fissiparous reproduction*. Having given birth to Mercury, the spoiled child of his mother, the old lady settled down into a quiet and careful matron, keeping good order in her household, and dispensing her bounties to all her offspring.

* Five, if we include the new planet.

It will be perceived that this is not the nebular hypothesis of Herschel and La Place. The author has indeed attempted to draw an outline of that hypothesis, but he has presented it in a loose and unguarded manner, with certain appendages which lead us to question the profundity of his knowledge of mechanical forces, and to challenge his capacity as an expounder of nature's jurisprudence. The following extract will inform our readers what is the nebular hypothesis which La Place reduced to form. It is from the pen of Whewell.

"La Place conjectures that in the original condition of the solar system the sun revolved upon his axis, surrounded by an atmosphere which, in virtue of an excessive heat, extended far beyond the orbits of all the planets, the planets as yet having no existence. The heat gradually diminished, and as the solar atmosphere contracted by cooling, the rapidity of its rotation increased by the laws of rotatory motion, and an exterior zone of vapor was detached from the rest, the central attraction being no longer able to overcome the increased centrifugal force. This zone of vapor might in some cases retain its form, as we see it in Saturn's ring; but more usually the ring of vapor would break into several masses, and these would generally coalesce into one mass, which would revolve about the sun. Such portions of the solar atmosphere, abandoned successively at different distances, would form planets in the state of vapor. These planets, it appears from mechanical considerations, would have each its rotatory motion, and, as the cooling of the vapor still went on, would each produce a planet, which might have satellites and rings, formed from the planet in the same manner as the planets were formed from the atmosphere of the sun."*

There are serious objections to the hypothesis, even in the modest form in which it is here presented. An hypothesis is worthless, unless it will give a consistent explanation of the associated facts. This hypothesis will account for many facts in the solar system, but not for the inclinations of the axes of rotation to the planes of revolution, nor for the retrograde motions of the satellites of Uranus, nor for the superior density of Uranus to that of Saturn, nor for the rotatory motions of Jupiter and Saturn being more rapid than those of the smaller and denser planets, nor for the existence and anomalous motions of comets, nor for the great inclination of some of the planetary orbits to the plane of the sun's equator. The law of inertia requires that the direction of the sun's axis should remain the same, from the commencement of its rotation to the

* Third Bridgewater Treatise, pp. 143, 144.

present time; and the law of centrifugal force requires that the great circle of each detached ring should lie in the plane of the sun's equator. There is another objection, which seems to us to be still more fatal. The moons of Jupiter and the earth turn upon their axes in the same time that they revolve round their primaries. But the hypothesis requires that satellites, thrown off as rings of vapor, should follow the same law as their primaries, and increase the velocity of their rotation as they condensed into the solid state. These objections, to the most defensible form of which the hypothesis is susceptible, ought certainly to prevent its being taken as the basis of a system of reasoning in favor of a universal creative law.

Let us next examine that bolder phase of the hypothesis which our author has presented in his book. In his solicitude to dispense with the agency of God, he goes back three steps behind the starting point of La Place, and, by so doing, proposes a problem which he not only fails to solve, but which is absolutely insolvable. The problem of La Place may be enunciated thus: *Given a solar nucleus with a nebulous atmosphere rotating on an axis, to demonstrate the possibility of forming a system of planets and satellites by dynamical laws.* The following is our author's problem: *Matter expanded by heat so as to fill space, and the laws of matter given, to develop the bodies of the universe.* The data of La Place leave room for the personal agency of God; our author leaves him nothing to do but to sit still and look on. La Place solved his problem; yet he called his hypothesis a *conjecture*, and published it with great diffidence, as possibly, rather than probably, true. Our author signally fails in his solution, yet takes his hypothesis as a fact on which to build his subsequent reasonings,—the corner-stone of his "great generalization." We say this advisedly, though he denies, in his "Explanations," that the overthrow of the nebular hypothesis can weaken, in the least, his subsequent argument in favor of a universal creative law. He has the hardihood to say this, when it is obvious to the most superficial reader that he has made the fact of the creation of the solar system by law—a fact which he attempts to prove in no other way than by assuming the truth of the nebular hypothesis—the basis of an argument *a fortiori* on which he rings the changes through the remainder of his book. If the hypothesis is immaterial to his purpose, why does he invoke its aid in the establishment of conclusions which could be established just as well without it? The reader can judge what use he makes of it from the following extracts:—

"We have seen powerful evidence, that the construction of this globe and its associates, and inferentially that of all the other globes

of space, was the result, not of any immediate or personal exertion on the part of the Deity, but of natural laws which are expressions of his will. What is to hinder our supposing that the organic creation is also the result of natural laws, which are in like manner an expression of his will? More than this, the fact of the cosmical arrangements being an effect of natural law, *is a powerful argument for the organic arrangements being so likewise;* for how can we suppose that the august Being who brought all these countless worlds into form by the simple establishment of a natural principle flowing from his mind, was to interfere personally and specially on every occasion when a new shell-fish or reptile was to be ushered into existence on *one* of these worlds? Surely this idea is too ridiculous to be for a moment entertained."

"We see that matter has originally been diffused in one mass, of which the spheres are portions. Consequently inorganic matter must be presumed to be everywhere the same, although probably with differences in the proportions of ingredients in different globes, and also some differences of conditions. Out of a certain number of the elements of inorganic matter are composed organic bodies, both vegetable and animal; such must be the rule in Jupiter and Sirius, as it is here. We therefore are all but certain that herbaceous and ligneus fibre, that flesh and blood, are the constituents of the organic beings of all those spheres which are as yet seats of life."

"As one set of laws produced all orbs, and their motions, and geognostic arrangements, so one set of laws overspread them all with life. The whole productive or creative arrangements are therefore in perfect unity."—*Vestiges*, pp. 116, 122, 123.

Through such flights of adventurous speculation does this writer soar, upborne by his elastic hypothesis. Remove the buoyant medium which sustains him, and he will fall, flapping his useless wings like a bird in a vacuum. Let us see whether or not this can be done.

The first step in our author's cosmogony is to break up the universally diffused and intensely heated vapor (which he takes as his starting point) into distinct nebulæ. He says that "the formation of systems out of this matter implies a change of some kind with regard to the condition of the heat." What change, we ask; and by what law? Radiation is impossible; for the incandescent vapor fills space. Conduction is impossible; for the vapor is in equilibrium, and, of course, has a uniform temperature. It cannot become latent; for that would imply an increase in the capacity of the vapor for heat; and it is well known to everybody, except the author, that this is an effect of expansion, and not of contraction. It cannot disappear by chemical action; for chemical processes which increase the density of bodies, increase their temperature also, and the new supply of free heat could not be got rid of. It is amusing to see how jauntily he trips along over this dif-

ficulty, as if it were but a pebble in his path; when to a well-trained and logical mind it would be an impassable barrier to further progress. "We do not know enough of the laws of heat to enable us to surmise how the necessary change in this respect was brought about, but we can trace some of the steps and consequences of the process." This is what we call leaping the fence instead of opening the gate.

In the next place, granting him a nebula, how is a nucleus to be formed in it? Here again he cuts the knot which he cannot untie. "Of nebulous matter, in its original state, we know too little to enable us to suggest how nuclei should be established in it. But supposing that from a peculiarity in its constitution nuclei are formed," then all becomes easy: gravitation will do the rest. He admits that he knows no law by which a nucleus could be formed in a nebula; and then presumes that it was formed: we alledge that we know no law by which a nucleus could be formed; and therefore presume that it was not formed. Let the reader choose between the two presumptions. Even Epicurus, who carried out materialism to a greater extent than any man has ever done since, if we except the author of the Vestiges, saw that a nucleus could not be formed by the atomic theory of Democritus, and was compelled to ascribe to his atoms two species of innate motion, one oblique to the other, by which their contact, and the nucleus of a future world, became possible.* But this writer, with his nebulous fluid in so highly elastic a state that it is millions of times rarer than atmospheric air, not in motion, but in equilibrium, imagines that he can establish a nucleus by some law which he cannot imagine!

Let us now grant him his nucleus, and see with what facility he will set his nebulous sphere a whirling. "It is a well-known law in physics, that when fluid matter collects toward or meets in a centre, it establishes a rotary motion." We tell him that there is no such law in physics, nor any law by which matter impelled or attracted by a single force can be made to move in any other than right lines. Nothing less than two forces can produce curvilinear motion, and equal forces in opposite directions neutralize each other. In his Explanations the author admits this as an "abstract truth," but contends that no actual confluence corresponds to it. If this is an abstract truth, what becomes of his "*well-known law in physics?*" What is an abstract truth in physics but the expression of a *physical law?* He is constructing a system by law, and gives no reason why the matter on which he operates disobeys law. We are aware that the elder Herschel suggested the possibility

* History of Philosophy, vol. i, p. 150.

of a confluence of nebulous matter producing rotary motion; but he did not justify the suggestion by explaining the mode. The *discoveries* of this truly great man have gained him immortal honor, and added much to human knowledge; but his *speculations* have never commanded the assent of scientific men, and we cannot permit his unsupported *conjecture* to overthrow a fundamental law of motion. The author, in his Sequel, cites Professor Nichol, an eloquent advocate of the nebular hypothesis, as authority that "it is barely possible that such a flow of matter from opposite sides could be so nicely balanced in any case, that the opposite momenta or floods would neutralize each other, and produce a condition of rest." We bow to truth, but not to authority; and the truth is, that such opposing momenta could not but neutralize each other, unless some disturbing force turned them aside from the attracting centre. Neither Dr. Nichol nor the author of the Vestiges has attempted to show how such a disturbing force could be generated. Their difficulty is rendered vastly more formidable by the fact that the rows of converging particles are not confined to one plane, but move in every possible radius of the nebulous sphere. Even if the opposing forces in one plane should happen to produce a small resultant in any direction, those of another plane would be just as likely to produce a resultant in another direction; and if any rotation were established, it would be the effect of a composition of an infinite number of partial and conflicting resultants, each of which must be very small, into a final resultant which must be much smaller. Do these writers consider that such an infinitesimal force as this will not answer the demands of their hypothesis? Do they reflect that they must account for the production of the entire quantity of motion now existing in the solar system? Whatever the author of the Vestiges may think, the contraction of the nebulous mass, after its rotation was established, could generate no motion at all. The shrinking of the revolving nebula would accelerate the *velocity* of its rotation, because the different parts would thereby rotate in smaller circles, and the superior momentum of the outer portions would be distributed throughout the entire mass, but the momentum of the whole system would remain for ever the same. All this is so plain to those who have any clear conception of the relations of force and motion, that nothing more need be said about it. The writer's scheme for producing the rotation of his nebula, reveals his ignorance of the first principles of mechanics; and we advise him to study the laws of nature, by the rigorous methods of analysis, before he again ventures to set himself up as their expounder.

The author refers to the whirlwind, whirlpool, and funnel vortex, as minor results of that "well-known law in physics" which, in his Sequel, he admits to be in conflict with "abstract truth," and therefore no law at all. As he again calls in the same phenomena to aid him in his Explanations, we will show that these vortices are established by conditions which do not and cannot exist in a nebula. It may be stated, as a preliminary remark, that in each of the examples referred to, there is a partial displacement of the fluid at the points of convergence, while in a nebula the fluid converges toward a point of superior density. An eddy, or whirlpool, in water, is the effect of two forces, the momentum of a current and gravity, acting in different directions. When water flows past an obstruction which narrows its channel, it communicates motion to the contiguous fluid below the obstruction, and by thus drawing it away, causes a depression of the surface below the general level of the stream. Gravity then causes a reflex current to restore the equilibrium; and a rotation about the point of greatest depression is the result of the joint action of the two forces. Similar eddies are formed by wind on the leeward side of buildings which obstruct its motion. Can the author find any force in his nebula to give a lateral direction to the converging fluid?

A whirlwind is produced somewhat differently. In consequence of local heat, a column of air becomes rarefied, and ascends; or, as Dr. Hare suggests,* an electrified current of air counteracts, within its sphere, the pressure of the atmosphere, and ascends in obedience to its elastic force, while a horizontal conflux of the surrounding air, in obedience to pressure, takes place toward the rarefied column to restore the equilibrium. The rotary motion is caused by a force which gives to the horizontal currents a direction oblique to the axis of the rarefied column. This disturbance is an effect of the diurnal motion of the earth and its atmosphere. It is well known that the momentum of the air, due to the earth's rotation, is greater as the latitude is less. Therefore the aerial currents from the direction of the equator would be carried forward a little to the east of the rarefied axis; and those from the direction of the pole would incline as far to the west. The result would be a gyratory movement from right to left in north latitudes, and from left to right in south latitudes: and these are the actual directions of the rotation of whirlwinds in the two hemispheres, as numerous observations have abundantly proved. We aver that no cause of a tangential force like this can be shown to have existed in a primeval nebula.

* Transactions of the Am. Phil. Soc., vol. v, New Series, p. 347.

The vortex in a funnel is not caused by the confluence of the liquid toward the orifice, but by inequalities in the surface of the vessel; or, more commonly, by a horizontal rotation of the liquid, established in the funnel by the act of filling it. If we stop the orifice, and pour in the liquid obliquely, we shall perceive a gyratory motion, though there is, of course, no determination of the liquid toward a point; and if we immediately open the orifice, the gyration will be accelerated by the combined influence of gravity and the previously established horizontal momentum, until the centrifugal force displaces the liquid about the axis of the funnel, and a vortex is formed. But if the funnel be symmetrical, its surface smooth, its axis vertical, and its orifice closed till the agitations caused by filling have entirely ceased, no vortex nor any tendency to rotation will be perceived, however frequently we repeat the experiment. With these precautions, the equilibrium of the liquid in the funnel is as perfect as it is in the nebulous vapor before the process of condensation commences; and gravity being the only moving force, no rotation can be established in either case. The author fails, therefore, in the third step of his law-creative process. He cannot establish a perpetual motion without the assistance of a power disconnected with his machinery, and independent of it. His cosmological problem is unsolved, and insolvable; and the very hook of his chain of reasoning is broken, and will not sustain a single link.

We have thus followed our author down to that condition of his nebula which La Place assumes as his starting point—a nebulous atmosphere, with a solar nucleus, rotating upon an axis. Let us next examine his contrivance for detaching a ring. La Place supposes the ring to have been thrown off in the state of vapor by the centrifugal force. Our author supposes that the equatorial parts of the oblate nebula solidified by refrigeration, and that the subsequent contraction of the fluid mass caused a separation from the "solidifying crust." His meaning can be nothing but this, that the cohesion of the crust aided the centrifugal force to resist the central attraction. There are two objections to this scheme, each of which is fatal to it. If the mass of the sun were expanded uniformly, so as to fill the dimensions of the earth's orbit, its matter would be many thousand times rarer than air; and if we imagine it expanded to the dimensions of the orbit of Uranus, the tenuity of its vapor, though expressible by numbers, would be inconceivable. The solidification of a crust to form the planetary rings would, therefore, be impossible. Secondly, the fragments of a solid ring

could not form, by agglomeration, a perfect spheroid like a planet, but an irregular angular mass. Much less could they form a spheroid capable of contracting so as to throw off a succession of secondary rings, as the elder planets must have done.

Let us now glance at some of the subsidiary props with which our author attempts to support his hypothesis. He tells us that "the planets show a progressive increase of bulk, and diminution of density, from the one nearest to the sun to that which is most distant;" and he argues that this is precisely what the hypothesis would lead us to expect. This is an instance of our author's facility in bending facts to suit theory. Any astronomical *liber primus* will assure him that the density of Uranus is more than twice that of Saturn; and that his law of bulks, even if he amends the mistake of nature, and puts the four asteroids together, has four exceptions to four examples. If his statement of the facts would raise a presumption in favor of the hypothesis, the actual facts must make as strongly against it. The point of his weapon is therefore turned against his own bosom; but as he admits the objection in his Explanations, we will imagine that we see the upright thumbs of the spectators, and spare the disarmed gladiator.

The author sees also in the ring of Saturn a powerful argument in favor of his hpyothesis. We will not stop to question whether a "solidifying crust," detached by the shrinking of the planet, could spread itself out to the breadth and thinness of the ring of Saturn; but, after making a single remark, we will yield him all the foothold which the ring of Saturn will give him. This ring is an exception to the ordinary working of his creative laws, and he was bound, as a matter of course, to give us a reason for so wide a deviation from an established rule. His explanation amounts to this: The rings which formed the planets and satellites broke up in consequence of inequalities in their structure; Saturn alone happened to throw off a pair of rings so uniform that they could not break up. Now a man who knew something of the celestial mechanism has assured us that "inequalities are necessary to maintain the ring in its equilibrium about Saturn. For if it were perfectly similar in all its parts, the equilibrium would be troubled by the smallest force, such as the attraction of a comet or satellite; and the ring would finally be precipitated upon the body of Saturn."*

* La Place, Méchanique Céleste, vol. ii, p. 512.

Every person who understands the distinction between stable and unstable equilibrium will perceive at once that La Place is right, and the author of the Vestiges wrong.

Another argument is drawn from the experiments of Plateau, an account of which is given in the Explanations. The Belgian professor succeeded in throwing off a ring from a globule of oil suspended in a mixture of alcohol and water, by means of a copper disc, which was first put into rapid rotation, and then suddenly stopped. These experiments are interesting illustrations of molecular attraction and centrifugal force; but they lend no aid to the nebular hypothesis. All the conditions under which the ring of oil is produced are different from those which could exist in a nebula. The oil, poured into the mixture, collected into a sphere, as was to be expected. If he had proved that the particles of oil, distributed throughout the mixture, could produce a *revolving* sphere by collecting at a common centre, he would have done something to the purpose.

But the author places his chief reliance upon the appearances presented by different nebulæ as seen with telescopes. "Nebulous stars exist in every stage of concentration, down to that in which we see only a common star with a slight bur around it. It may be presumed that all these are but stages of a progress, just as if seeing a boy, a youth, a middle-aged man, and an old man together, we might presume that the whole were only variations of one being." This is an example of reasoning by illustration—a method in which this writer delights, and which is well suited to his prolific imagination. Let us try to answer him in kind. Suppose four human beings placed at different and unknown distances from our eyes. We see the gray hairs and wrinkles of the nearest, and we know that he is an old man. The second cannot be distinguished from a middle-aged man; the third looks like a stripling; and the fourth like a small boy. But a telescope shows the wrinkles and gray hairs of the second; and a higher power reveals the same on the third. May we not reasonably suspect that a still more perfect instrument would prove that the supposed boy is also an old man? Now every improvement in the telescope enables us to resolve nebulæ, before unresolved, into clusters of stars. May we not, then, begin to suspect—nay, even to form a strong presumption—that they are all resolvable? May we not safely conclude that they are not embryotic worlds at all, but veterans, full of years and strength, called into existence *in the beginning*, when "God created the heavens and the earth?" Our author, in his Sequel, clings to the unresolved nebulæ with a tenacity which shows how well he

loves his hypothesis, and how clearly he sees that it cannot survive them. As one after another disappears before the unrelenting sweep of Lord Rosse's gigantic reflector, he grasps the few that are left, or which he hopes may be left, with the desperation of a drowning man. The fact is, this great telescope is making sad havoc among the old nebulæ on which the hypothesis of Herschel was based; and it is possible that not one of them may survive its keen encounter, much less the most unsubstantial of them all, the *nebular hypothesis*.

2. *Zoogony.* The author next draws a rapid outline of the geological history of our planet, and summons the fossil relics of nature's ancient charnel-house to prove a *general progress* in vegetable and animal life from simple to complex forms. Our limits forbid us to give this part of the book more than a passing glance; and we waive the discussion of it with less reluctance because a scientific protest against it, drawn up by the hand of a master, has already been placed upon record. A writer,* "whose foot is on his native hills" in geological questions, has shown that the author of the Vestiges is not only incompetent to translate the hieroglyphics of nature's fossil archives; but that he plays the interpolator with the translations of men who are competent, by foisting in spurious passages which corrupt the genuine meaning of the text. But whatever may be the author's qualifications for the work which he has undertaken, it is obvious to all who have kept themselves informed of the progress of fossil discovery, that the time for generalization has not yet arrived. The scale of animated nature formed to-day, will require a new adjustment to-morrow; for the labors of geologists are constantly revealing new proofs of the antiquity of some of the higher forms of the vertebrata. A few years since, the discovery of the footmarks of birds in the new red sandstone was received with strong distrust. Geologists were slow to believe that the genealogy of these creatures extended back to so remote an era, because none of their remains had yet been found in those ancient strata. But the industry of Hitchcock has already placed the fact beyond dispute or doubt; and men are hardly recovered from their surprise at so unexpected a revelation, when it is announced that the vestiges of birds and reptiles have been discovered in the carboniferous series of Pennsylvania.† These facts are fatal to the hypothesis that "species followed each other in an order at once of development and of time." We might take our stand on the single fact, that the highest class but one of

* Edinburgh Review for July, 1845.

† Silliman's Journal for April, 1845.

the vertebrata existed in the first geological series which was formed after the appearance of dry land above the surface of the primeval ocean, and challenge our author to explain the fact consistently with his hypothesis. He cannot do it, even with all the latitude which his theory of *loops* in the ascending line of development gave him in his third edition; nor with the far wider scope which that fortunate after-birth of his prolific imagination, his theory of *stirpes*, gives him in his Explanations. Besides, what proof have we that land mammifers did not exist at the age of the new red, or even in the carbonigenous era? Not a bone of the birds which left those footmarks in the soft sand upon the shore of the ancient sea has been exhumed; and mammals are not so much in the way of writing autobiographies upon the sea-beach as birds are. Dr. Hitchcock, referring to the effects of his discoveries, says:—

"And really this new field promises much fruit to geologists. It has already learned them to be cautious in asserting the non-existence of land animals from the absence of their remains in a formation. In the valley of the Connecticut, for instance, more than thirty species of such animals, some of them of giant size, have left no other certain evidence of their existence save their foot-prints and a few coprolites. And we can hardly believe that birds were the only vertebral animals that dwelt in that valley during the red sandstone period."*

But if we admit that part of the argument contained in the author's geological and fossil history, which is intended to prove a general progress of animated beings during the formation of successive strata, we shall not narrow, in the least degree, the grounds of the defense of creation by a Creator. Nobody supposes that the supreme Being does not make use of means to accomplish his purposes, nor that time is a matter of the slightest consideration with him. He to whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," might, beyond all question, have caused the earth to go through that series of changes which geology claims, and have peopled it with successive species of plants and animals, each adapted to the conditions in which it was placed, and each disappearing when the conditions were no longer favorable to its existence, or when more powerful and hostile species invaded its territories and usurped its dominion. Whatever conception this writer, "who cannot separate nature from God himself," may form of that being, it is less difficult for us to believe that "God created every living thing that moveth," than that he elaborated a system of

* Report on Ichnolithology, or Fossil Footmarks.

material laws by whose spontaneous action every living thing that moveth was gradually developed. And we confess our total inability to comprehend the condition of the mind of that man who could make the impious declaration, that the production of any living creature, however humble to the vulgar eye, "would have been a most paltry exercise of creative power." If it were a paltry exercise of creative power to make a mollusk, would it have been a less paltry exercise of the infinite Intelligence, while framing a system of laws, to make the necessary arrangements by which a mollusk should appear at a particular time? But if the mollusk was not a part of the original conception in the legislative Will, its creation was entirely fortuitous, and the veil which covers the writer's atheism becomes transparent.

Let us now examine that point in the author's argument for which the geological history was intended to be so shaped as to prepare the mind of his reader, *the origin of organic life*. The problem is to develop a living being from brute matter by the unassisted operation of the laws of this same brute matter. The agent which is to bear him triumphantly over the wide gulf which separates death from life, and vivify the senseless atoms at his bidding, is electricity—an agent which he informs us "is almost as metaphysical as ever mind was supposed to be." Let us see how easily and logically he makes out his electro-creation. "The fundamental form of organic being is a globule, having a new globule forming within itself." Globules have been produced in albumen by electricity; and the production of albumen by artificial means, the only step in the process wanting, though it has not yet been effected, "is known to be only a chemical process, the mode of which may be any day discovered in the laboratory." The conclusion is, that "the first step in the creation of life upon this planet was a chemico-electrical operation, by which simple germinal vesicles were produced." The ordinary chemical forces of a few inorganic elements, excited to a peculiar action by electricity, produced "the type of mature and independent being in the infusory animalcules, as well as the starting point of the fœtal progress of every higher individual in creation, both animal and vegetable."

Now we hardly know which is most wonderful, the extraordinary facility of this writer in arriving at conclusions, or the omnivorous credulity revealed by his array of pretended facts to support them. Some crystals resemble shrubs; therefore a vegetable, with its admirable apparatus for the decomposition of carbonic acid, ammonia, and water, and its complicated organs of assimilation and reproduction, may be formed by the mere juxtaposition of lifeless

particles in obedience to molecular forces! Because positive electricity looks like a tree, and negative electricity like its roots, therefore a tree is the brush realized! His long paragraph upon these electrical resemblances does not contain a particle either of scientific fact or rational argument. He also believes the stories about electrical horticulture and agriculture; but we hope he has learned, ere this, that the conducting wires, of whose efficacy he speaks, have failed to produce any fertilizing effects in all the experiments which have been made with them throughout Europe and America. If he has not, we commend to him an article in a recent number of the London Chemist for his enlightenment. A Dr. Forster had announced certain astonishing results of electro-culture, during the previous year, upon his farm in Scotland. Some gentlemen went to visit his apparatus; but not finding the doctor at home, they inquired of a shrewd lad who worked on the farm, whether the crops were better where the poles and wires were placed than on the rest of the field. He answered, "Weel, the crap sud be better, considering the additional pickle dung it got besides the wires; but that he could not say there was really any difference observable." The following extract describes the hopeful condition of the experiment at the time:—

"The poles and wires are placed in two very small fields, one of which is in pasture, and the other in a crop of barley. The first had not a living animal upon it; and humane and considerate it certainly was, for the total want of anything in the shape of grass, beyond the roots, would have starved any hill ewe, nibble she ever so eagerly. The devoted field, instead of being electrified, seemed to be paralyzed; and will to all appearance require some 'additional pickles' to revive its sensibilities after the shock it has sustained. Then as to the barley, it seems neither to have suffered nor been ameliorated by the magic wires, for no perceptible difference can be seen over the field."*

We have not yet done with our author's facts. He tells us that shell has been formed upon a cloth-dresser's wheel. What of that? Shell is neither a living nor an organized body. It is a compound of gelatine, a proximate organic principle, with carbonate of lime. Did the wheel produce the gelatine, or did it come from the animal substances used in dressing the cloth? Again, Prevost and Dumas formed globules in albumen by electricity. Very likely; but were they living globules? Were they even organized globules? Not at all. They were organic globules, because they were formed in an organic body; but had they the new

* London Chemist for October, 1845.

globules forming within them? Perhaps they bore as perfect resemblance to the nucleated cells, which are the basis of vegetable and animal substances, as the arbor Dianæ to a shrub, or the electrical brush to a tree, or the ovum of the mammal tribes to the young of the infusory animalcules! What a pity the French chemists did not preserve and nourish these precious germs! They might have been the basis of a new *stirps*—the root of that "higher type of humanity" for which this writer looks and longs: those "favored latter children of Nature, who have not lived till the throes and troubles of her maternal state were past!"

The author next brings forward his witnesses to prove that animals have come into existence otherwise than from living germs which were produced by creatures like themselves.

"Perhaps the prevailing doctrine is in nothing placed in greater difficulties than it is with regard to the entozoa, or creatures which live within the bodies of others. These creatures do, and apparently can, live nowhere else than in the interior of other living bodies, where they generally take up their abode in the viscera, but also sometimes in the chambers of the eye, the interior of the brain, the serous sacs, and other places having no communication from without."

"There is another series of facts akin to the above, and which deserve not less attention. The pig, in its domestic state, is subject to the attacks of a hydatid, from which the wild animal is free, hence the disease called measles in pork. The domestication of the pig is, of course, an event subsequent to the origin of man; indeed, comparatively speaking, a recent event. Whence, then, the first progenitor of this hydatid? So also there is a tinea which attacks dressed wool, but never touches it in its unwashed state. A particular insect disdains all food but chocolate; and the larva of the *oinopota cellaris* lives nowhere but in wine and beer, all of these being articles manufactured by man. There is likewise a creature called the *pymelodes cyclopum*, which is only found in certain cavities connected with certain specimens of the volcanic formation in South America, dating from a time posterior to the arrangements of the earth for our species. Whence the first pymelodes cyclopum?"—*Vestiges*, pp. 134, 137.

In every one of these examples the author takes for granted the very thing which he ought to prove, if he would make them of the least avail in his argument. That these creatures live nowhere but in the situations in which they have been observed, is a gratuitous assumption, unsupported by the shadow of proof, or even of probability. How does he know that his chocolate-eater will not thrive upon some of the materials of which chocolate is composed? How does he know that his wine-bibber may not satisfy his intemperate appetite without being immersed, like Clarence, in a "Malmsey butt?" The vinous fermentation is a natural stage

in the decomposition of the juices of saccharine fruits, and the creature might have found a nidus for his larva as soon as such fruits began to ripen and decay. Again, was it provided with malice aforethought, in the grand scheme of law, that pigs should be afflicted with measles, and that children should be tormented with *entozoa?* If he spurns the monstrous conclusion, then these creatures were made for a different purpose, and must find their proper home in other situations. But the ova of the entozoa are too weighty to be transported by winds. No matter. Food is brought from various and far distant localities, and the ova of these creatures may very easily be brought with it; and though we repudiate the idea that they were created to inhabit the viscera of men and animals, their development in such situations is certain. It is also certain that other creatures, whose appropriate residence is *known* to be elsewhere, have often lived and grown in the human stomach. Finally, the *pymelodes cyclopum*, found in the small mountain lakes in South America, can be accounted for as easily as the *gasterosteus aculeatus*, found in the salt-pans of the graduating-house at Nidda, in Hesse Darmstadt.* The ova of these diminutive fishes are conveyed to all places by the birds which feed upon them, and start into life wherever the conditions are favorable to their development. The author gains nothing by any of the cases he has cited; and the argument from analogy, that, as all the animals with whose origin we are acquainted proceed from ova produced by their like, so probably all others are produced in the same manner, remains in full force. Such a conclusion will not appear unreasonable until the advocates of equivocal generation can offer something more substantial than conjectures in favor of their hypothesis. The argument of Professor Owen,† against the equivocal generation of the infusoria, bears with almost equal force against the spontaneous production of any of those minute animals whose origin we are unable to trace out with certainty. Speaking of the multitudes of ova deposited by the polygastria in the stagnant pools which they inhabit, he says:—

"When the once thickly tenanted pool is dried up, and its bottom converted into a layer of dust, these inconceivably minute and light ova will be raised with the dust by the first puff of wind, diffused through the atmosphere, and may there remain long suspended, forming, perhaps, their share of the particles which we see flickering in the sunbeam, ready to fall into any collection of water,

* Liebig's Agricultural Chemistry, p. 121.

† Lectures on the Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of the Invertebrate Animals.

beaten down by every summer shower into the streams or pools which receive, or may be formed by, such showers, and, by virtue of their tenacity of life, ready to develop themselves wherever they may find the requisite conditions for their existence.

"The possibility, or rather the high probability, that such is the design of the oviparous generation of the infusoria, and such the common mode of the diffusion of their ova, renders the hypothesis of their equivocal generation, which has been so frequently invoked to explain their origin in new-formed natural or artificial infusions, quite gratuitous."—P. 31.

The author holds in reserve his main fact in order to make a decisive charge at the end of the battle, *à la mode de Napoleon;* and when, at last, the critical moment has arrived, he throws into the *mêlée* his bristling phalanx of *acari* with a flourish of trumpets. He believes that an animal has actually been produced from inorganic elements by an electrical current: not a nucleated cell, not a mere monad, as his hypothesis would require, but a highly organized creature of the articulate sub-kingdom. He sees no difficulty in the generation of a perfect insect, composed of oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, and nitrogen, in a solution of *silicate of potassa;* but cannot suppose that the microscopic eggs of the mite, which swarms in chemical laboratories, could by any possibility have fallen into the solution! He assumes at once, as an established fact, what few, if any, scientific men believe, and what Mr. Crosse himself never presumed to assert. After describing the conditions under which the acarus appeared, Mr. Crosse says:—

"The most simple solution of the problem which occurred to me was, that they arose from ova deposited by insects floating in the atmosphere, and that they might possibly be hatched by the electric action. * * Again, we have no right to assume that electric action is necessary to vitality, until such fact shall have been most distinctly proved. * * I never, for a moment, entertained the idea that the electric fluid had animated the organic remains of insects, or fossil eggs, previously existing in the stone or silica; and have formed no visionary theory which I would travel out of my way to support. * * I do not mean to assert that electricity has anything to do with their birth, as I have not made a sufficient number of experiments to prove or disprove it; and besides, I have not taken those necessary precautions which present themselves even to an unscientific view."*

The contrast between the philosophic caution of the experimenter, and the reckless assumption of the author, is by no means credit-

* Annals of Electricity, vol. ii, pp. 250, 253, 254.

able to the latter. But he informs us that Mr. Weekes used all possible precautions; and appends to his Sequel an account of the experiments given by Mr. Weekes himself. He used a solution of *ferrocyanide of potassium*, a compound which contains carbon and nitrogen, so that his electrical creator might have the necessary raw material to work upon, in the manufacture of living animals. The solution was placed in a wide-mouthed glass jar, from which the air was next expelled by a stream of oxygen, and the aperture closed with a metallic stopper, through which the conducting wires and a safety tube passed. In the bend of the safety tube he placed a globule of mercury, to serve as a valve for the escape of the gases arising from the decomposition of the inclosed materials, without admitting the external air. A tumbler, partly filled with the same solution, was left open; and the electric current from a constant battery was passed through both vessels. On the one hundred and sixty-sixth day, acari appeared in the tumbler; and on the day after, "swarms of acari were found on the cards, about the tumbler, both within and without, and also on the platform of the apparatus." In the inclosed solution a few acari were discovered at the end of two years and two months.

A reader unacquainted with chemical manipulations might regard this, as our author does, an *experimentum crucis;* but the practical chemist will at once detect a source of fallacy which vitiates the entire experiment; and makes him regret that "two excellent batteries," which might have been better employed, had been "worn out" in such useless labor. The defect was in his valve. There is no adhesion between mercury and glass; and every chemist knows that a globule of mercury in a bent tube will not prevent the slow passage of gases between the metal and the vitreous surface. Had the gaseous contents of the jar been tested at the termination of the experiment, atmospheric air would have been found in it. Besides, the motions of the globule of mercury, caused by the discharge of gas from the jar, and even by the changes of atmospheric pressure and temperature, could very easily have rolled in a few ova of the "swarms of acari" about the apparatus, some of which might have fallen into the tube above the mercury. The marvel is not that ova got into the jar, but that they did not get in sooner. Mr. Weekes must explain another difficulty before his conclusions will be entitled to the slightest consideration. If electricity were the vivifying agent, why did it not accomplish its work as quickly in the closed, as in the open vessel? One word more, and we have done with the Acarus Crossii and all other acari. If either Mr. Weekes or Mr. Crosse will repeat the experiment with

such precautions as were used by Professor Shulze, of Berlin, to prevent the introduction of living germs into the interior of the apparatus, he will arrive at the same results. Not a living creature will be produced, however long he may continue the experiment, and however many excellent batteries he may wear out.

We conclude, therefore, that organized and living bodies have never yet been formed by the chemistry of man. It remains to notice some considerations which induce us to believe that such a result can never be accomplished. No animal, unless possibly some of the infusoria, can exist upon inorganic elements.* Modern physiology has established this very important truth, that vegetables are the producers, and animals the consumers, of organic matter.† Plants, then, must have flourished upon our planet before animals could have existed. Under the influence of light, *living* plants decompose carbonic acid, water, and nitrogenous compounds, and form albumen, fibrin, and casein. Animals convert these first into chyle, then into blood, and finally into muscular fibre, gelatinous and cartilaginous tissues, and the other products which subserve the purposes of their economy. These are all processes of transformation, not of production. How then, when observation proves that an animal, already endowed with life, cannot assimilate inorganic matter, can we suppose that inorganic matter may become a living being in obedience to chemical forces? If inorganic elements will not sustain animal life, how can they produce it?

In chemical operations upon inorganic bodies, certain binary compounds are formed, in which the chemical forces are in a condition of stable equilibrium. But organized bodies are ternary or quaternary compounds, in which the forces are in unstable equilibrium. Disturb this equilibrium, and the affinities which produce binary compounds come into play, and the organic body undergoes spontaneous decomposition. Binary compounds are more stable than ternary, and ternary than quaternary. The more complicated the body, therefore, the less resistance will it offer to the stronger affinities, and the more rapid will be its decomposition. The great question is, how elements are brought into this condition of unstable equilibrium, and how that equilibrium is maintained? If we admit what Mülder seems to claim,‡ that the elements possess dormant forces, in obedience to which they will combine in such an order as to form organic bodies whenever the proper conditions arise to excite them to action; still the question, what and where

* Mulder's Chemistry of Vegetable and Animal Physiology, p. 109.

† Chemical and Physiological Balance of Organic Nature.

‡ Chemistry of Vegetable and Animal Physiology, p. 65.

is the power to establish these conditions, remains unanswered. According to our author, this power is electricity. But Faraday has demonstrated that electrical and chemical forces are identical.* The statement then amounts to this, that chemical force can excite itself to a mode of action contrary to its own laws. But, says our author, digestion has been carried on in the stomach of an animal after death, by substituting a galvanic battery for its brain. The digestion might have proceeded just as well without the battery, for animal digestion is a process very different from vegetable digestion. Chymification is a purely chemical process, in which an *organized* is transformed into an *organic* body, as muscular fibre into albumen. The process is independent of vitality, and is "exactly similar to those processes of decomposition or transformation which are known as putrefaction, fermentation, or decay."† In some cases, digestion proceeds with such energy after death, that the stomach itself becomes a prey to its decomposing force. If the author's battery had re-established the circulation of the blood, and restored the power of assimilation, and re-awakened consciousness and sensation, he might, with some color of truth, have made the daring and reckless assertion of "the absolute identity of the brain with a galvanic battery."

How then are the forces which are concerned in organization excited in dead matter? The riddle of the Sphinx is yet unsolved. The dark question, propounded in every form, by every generation of men, is an enigma still. Wherein does a grain of wheat that will germinate, differ from one that will not? Wherein does an egg that may be hatched by incubation, differ from one that cannot? In a word, what difference exists between a dead man and a living one? The organic matter and the organs are there, with their elements united in obedience to chemical affinities, or, if you prefer, by their electrical forces. Why do they not perform their appropriate functions? The wonderful apparatus of cords and levers is there; why does not the man move? The eye is there, with its lens and its retina; why does he not see? The ear is there, with its delicate web of nerves; why does he not hear? The lungs are there; why does he not breathe? The heart is there; why do not its systole and diastole send the warm blood bounding through the arteries? The brain is there; but where are consciousness, and memory, and imagination, and reason? No response can be given to these interrogatories, save that the power which moved this complicated machinery has departed. The

* Researches in Electricity, series viii, article 918.

† Liebig's Animal Chemistry, p. 108.

chemist has gone from his laboratory. *Life* is not there. Now physiologists of the materialist school may sneer if they will, at what they are pleased to call the "vulgar error" of regarding "life and vitality" as "realities;"* but we must still be permitted to employ those terms to indicate the unknown cause of certain phenomena, which cannot be referred to any known cause. We must speak of life as a reality, until they favor us with some proof more convincing than their mere *dictum*, that its phenomena are but results of the ordinary forces of matter. Such proof they cannot give; for all the changes which chemists have effected in organic bodies, have been transformations *downward*, toward the inorganic; and not *upward*, to the more highly organized. The chemist can transform starch into sugar, and sugar into alcohol, and alcohol into acetic acid; but he cannot reverse the order. He may change woody fibre into starch, and starch into gum, and gum into oxalic acid; but he cannot take a single step on the ascending ladder of organization.

"Facilis descensus Averni:
Noctes atque dies patet atri janua Ditis:
Sed revocare gradum, superasque evadere ad auras,
Hoc opus, hic labor est."

3. *Zoonomy.*

"The whole train of animated beings, from the simplest and oldest up to the highest and most recent, are to be regarded as a series of *advances of the principle of development*, which have depended upon external physical circumstances, to which the resulting animals are appropriate."

"I suggest as an hypothesis countenanced by much that is ascertained, and likely to be further sanctioned by much that remains to be known, that the first step [after the production of living germs by electricity] was *an advance, under favor of peculiar conditions, from the simplest forms of being to the next more complicated, and this through the medium of the ordinary process of generation.*"

"The idea, then, which I form of the progress of organic life upon our earth—and the hypothesis is applicable to all similar theatres of vital being—is, *that the simplest and most primitive type, under a law to which that of like-production is subordinate, gave birth to the type next above it, that this again produced the next higher, and so on to the very highest;* the stages of advance being in all cases very small, namely, from one species only to another, so that the phenomenon has always been of a simple and modest character."—*Vestiges*, pp. 154, 155, 170.

This hypothesis, which our author announces with as much parade and solemnity as if it had never before been thought of, is but another phasis of the monstrous doctrines of Lamarck and

* Draper's Chemistry of Plants, pp. 6, 41.

St. Hilaire. He differs from the latter in attempting to reconcile the doctrine of final causes with transmutation of species, and unity of plan in organized bodies. This, so far as we are informed, has never before been seriously undertaken by any physiologist; and we award him full credit for originality in his endeavor to make out a logical impossibility, and to balance himself securely upon both horns of a dilemma.* He differs from the former, chiefly, in substituting an unintelligible for an intelligible cause of the supposed transmutations. Lamarck attributed the transmutations to the efforts of animals to satisfy the wants incident to the various conditions in which they were placed.† The organism was not adapted to the mode of life, but the mode of life gradually developed the required organism. The duck, for example, was not made web-footed that it might swim; but finding itself in circumstances in which it was obliged to seek its food in water, the repeated stretching of its toes in the act of swimming extended the skin between them into a web. The quadrumana were not provided with four hands to enable them to climb trees; but having a liking for fruits, their efforts at climbing, though rather clumsy at first, developed after awhile the appropriate prehensile apparatus. Here we have a process which, however visionary, is at least comprehensible. But our author, while he sees a progressive tendency in nature, can give us no better account of the cause of each advance toward perfection, than that it was made "under favor of peculiar conditions," but "the nature of these conditions we can only conjecture."‡

If he intended to give us any definite conception of his plan, he ought to have informed us whether he means to be understood that the original organic germs are identical as well as similar; whether or not the progress of external conditions caused the successive stages in the development of living forms; and whether there has been one line of organic development, or many. After a diligent search through his two volumes, we are forced to the conclusion, either that his opinions are *rudimental*, so that he does not know himself what he means; or that they have been developed in *double lines*, so that he means one thing at one time, and another at another. In the Vestiges, he does not alledge, in terms, that all germs are identical; but many significant expressions, as well as the general scope of the reasoning, lead us to infer that he intended to be so understood. In the Explanations,§ he denies that he has asserted their identity, but still is careful not to assert

* See Whewell's History of the Inductive Sciences, vol. iii, p. 574.

† Philosophie Zoologique, tom. i, p. 232.

‡ Vestiges, pp. 155, 161. § P. 77.

the contrary. Now the primitive germs of all organic beings are identical, or they are not. If they are identical, why is one invariably developed into a cryptogamous plant, another into a crocodile, and a third into a man? If they are not identical, how can the laws of nature, which are uniform in their operations, produce different bodies from the same materials, under the same circumstances, by means of the same electrical forces?

Again, law brought about successive changes in the surface of the land, in the composition of the atmosphere, and in the distribution and temperature of the seas; and then law developed, from pre-existing species of plants and animals, new forms and higher species adapted to the new conditions. What we wish to know is, whether the advance in living beings was a *consequence* of the geological progress, or a mere *sequence in time*, depending upon a different law. If he affirm the former, then it can be demonstrated that the favorable conditions have existed without the corresponding organic advances having been made. Was poor Australia, for example, so far belated in the race of development, that when it was discovered by civilized men, it was not a fitting abode for any quadrupeds higher than kangaroos? If he affirm the latter, then he gives up the grand idea which it is the object of his book to illustrate, a unity of plan in creation. He actually affirms both.

"There are, indeed, abundant appearances as if, throughout all the changes of the surface, the various kinds of organic life invariably *pressed in*, immediately on the specially suitable conditions arising, so that no place which could support any form of organic being might be left for any length of time unoccupied."

"Organic life *presses in*, as it has been remarked, wherever there is room and encouragement for it, the forms being such as suit the circumstances, and in a certain relation to them, as, for example, where the limestone-forming seas produce an abundance of corals, crinoidea, and shell-fish."—*Vestiges*, pp. 114, 120.

Finding this proposition utterly untenable, he wheels about, in his Sequel, to the opposite ground, with apparently the most innocent unconsciousness that he is perpetrating a downright self-contradiction.

"The groves which formed the coal-beds might have been a fitting habitation for reptiles, birds, and mammals, as such groves are at the present day; yet we see none of the last of these classes, and hardly any trace of the two first, in that period of the earth. Where the iguanodon lived, the elephant might have lived; but there was no elephant at that time. The sea of the lower Silurian era was capable of supporting fish; but no fish existed. It hence forcibly appears that *theatres of life must have lain unserviceable, or in the possession of a tenantry inferior to what might have enjoyed them, for many ages.*" —*Explanations*, pp. 106, 107.

This is certainly a "*bouleversement*"* as complete as he attributes to Uranus; and his retrograde motion is as decided as that of the satellites of the sun's first-born. We think, however, that the logical bouleversement is more easily explicable than the planetary, if we may judge by his excruciating attempt to explain the latter.† He was stunned by the hammer of his rock-delving opponent, the geologist of the Edinburgh Review, and recoiled to this new position in a state of dizzy bewilderment. He returns to the charge, however, with the pertinacity of another philosopher of the same school, when under the "noble stroke" of his antagonist,

> "Ten paces huge
> He back recoiled; the tenth on bended knee
> His massy spear upstayed."

This is not his only bouleversement. In the Vestiges, he contends for a "general scale" of animated being; but finding that the vertebrate sub-kingdom descends so low as the cyclostomous fishes, which he admits to be inferior to the crustacea and cephalopoda, creatures belonging to the articulata and mollusca, he makes his line so flexible that it can be bent downward into *loops*, and so slack-twisted that it diverges, in some places, into two or more separate threads.‡ But, in the Sequel, he abandons the general scale, and assumes "a plurality of lines, in which the orders, and even minuter subdivisions of each class, are ranged side by side."§ His genetic plan seems to be this: if we imagine the radiata, mollusca, articulata, and vertebrata, arranged horizontally one above the other,—each of these grand divisions being composed of its classes, orders, genera, and species, *stratified* also in their ascending order, the mammalia being the *upper crust*,—then each line or "*stirps*" ascends vertically through these divisions, and sends off lateral branches in each. This fanciful scheme brings no positive support to his argument; for he has not defined the boundaries of his *stirpes*, nor traced any one of them upward or downward more than a single step, nor even attempted to prove that they have any existence except in his own imagination. When Macleay and his coadjutors proposed their intensely artificial system of natural arrangement,—the celebrated hypothesis of circular groups, each circle containing five minor circles within itself, like the wheels within a wheel seen by the prophet,—they thought it necessary to construct some of these groups; to point out the affinities which united the different parts of a circle, and the analogies between the typical, sub-typical, and aberrant groups in each, to

* Vestiges, note, p. 7.
† Explanations, pp. 15. 16.
‡ Vestiges, pp. 113, 114.
§ Explanations, p. 49.

the corresponding groups in other circles, so as to give at least an air of probability to their scheme.* But our author, being "only a general student," submits to no such drudgery. He does not pretend to show that his hypothesis of stirpes is consistent with the facts, or with any of them. All the information which he condescends to give us, is the following remarkably definite and satisfactory statement!

"The lines or *stirpes* have all of them peculiar characteristics, which persist throughout the various grades of being passed through: one presenting carnivorous, another gentle and innocent animals, and so on."

"There is a unity, in all instances, in the moral as well as physical characters of the various members of one stirps: we only see it advancing from low to high characters, just as we see the fœtus of a high animal passing through various inferior stages before it reaches its proper mature character."—*Explanations*, pp. 49, 53.

It would really have been kind in him to enlighten us in regard to our own ancestry a few steps beyond those *novi homines*, the chimpanzes, by informing us what reptile, fish, or insect, has moral and physical characters in unity with ours, even if he found it difficult to trace out the respectable lineage, by the blazons of fossil heraldry, to the Adam and Eve of his own peculiar Genesis, a pair of omnivorous animalcules. The only advantage which he can derive from this new hypothesis, is to make it more difficult for his opponents to prove a negative: a thing which they are no more required to do, in the present case, than if he had asserted that the moon was made of green cheese. It is the *après coup* of a retreating enemy, who makes a feint to show a bold front while he abandons his ground. The facility with which he shifts his position, proves him to be an adroit tactician; and to possess in its highest development the trait which Napoleon attributed to this writer's countrymen—inability to discover when he is beaten.

We will now look the hypothesis of development by transmutation, whether in one line or many, more directly in the face. The facts adduced in support of the doctrine are the common stock-in-trade of the atheistic school of physiologists; and we must admit that in his operations with this stock the writer exhibits one proof at least of talent—the ability to do a large business with a small capital. He repeats the old story of the cabbage and cauliflower, of oats changing to rye, and forests of pine to beach and poplar; appeals to what he calls the abortive or rudimental organs of animals, to the similarity of the skeletons of the vertebrata, to the successive

* See Macleay's *Horæ Entomologicæ* and Swainson's *Classification of Animals*.

stages in the progress of the mammalian fœtus, to the changes produced in men and puppies by external conditions and modes of life, and concludes from all these that men are the offspring of monkeys; and that in two generations, by one incubation and one gestation, a rat may be hatched from a goose's egg! The evidence would have been less equivocal, perhaps, had he informed us that a higher mammal than a rodent had been produced in that manner, without losing, with the bodily form, the mental peculiarities of his grandmother.

We cannot admit that oats have been changed, by cropping down, into barley, rye, and wheat,* until the experimenter will inform us what precautions, if any, were taken to prevent the accidental presence of other grains in the soil. It is well known that seeds will in many instances germinate after passing through the alimentary canal of birds and quadrupeds; and this is undoubtedly the true explanation of the fact that plants, whose seeds are too heavy to be transported by winds, often spring up in localities where they had not previously appeared, whenever the condition of the soil becomes favorable to their growth. Thus, for example, when a forest of pines is consumed by fire, the potash, collected during many ages, is restored to the soil, and the germs of other trees, lying dormant in the ground, finding in the potash their appropriate nutriment, are immediately developed.† Again, the similarity of structure observed in the vertebrate animals is an interesting proof that they were formed according to one general plan, and this nobody denies; but it lends no countenance to the hypothesis that one type can by any possibility be changed into another. The rudimental organs, such as undeveloped feet in serpents, and mammæ in the human male, can be regarded, according to our author, "in no other light than as blemishes or blunders" in a system of creation by the direct agency of God; but they are only "harmless peculiarities" in a system of creation by law. We cannot comprehend this distinction. He tells us that he goes beyond Lamarck "to a very important point, the original divine conception of all the forms of being which natural laws were only instruments in working out and realizing."‡ If these organs are blemishes and blunders which impeach the divine skill in one case, do they not equally impeach the divine foresight in the other? But his assumption, that these organs are useless, is altogether gratuitous. There are other organs in animals of which anatomists have not yet discovered the use; but it is not their custom to pronounce them blemishes and blunders on account of their own ignorance.

* Explanations, p. 79. † Liebig's Agricultural Chemistry, p. 154.
‡ Vestiges, p. 177.

The author's capital argument, in support of his doctrine of development, is drawn from the resemblances of the mammalian fœtus, in its different stages, to successsive divisions and classes of inferior animals. The brain of a human embryo, for example, first resembles that of an avertebrated animal, then that of a fish, and successively that of a reptile, bird, rodent, ruminant, monkey, and man. The heart, also, at a certain stage, is like that of an insect; afterward it is two-chambered, like that of a fish; then three-chambered, like that of a reptile; and finally it becomes a full, four-chambered, mammal heart. The inference which he wishes us to draw from these resemblances, is, that every human being was once a zoophyte, and that he has passed in succession through every grade of being. The discoveries of Tiedemann and Serres warrant no such conclusion. All they prove is this: that *some* parts of a mammal fœtus of the highest order do bear *some* resemblance, in certain stages of their development, to corresponding parts of *some* of the inferior animals, at *some* stage of their development. So the eggs of a duck and hen do bear some resemblance to each other; but still the differences between them are so profound, that nothing but a duck can proceed from the one, and nothing but a chicken from the other. The heart and brain, like all the other organs of the human fœtus, are in a state of formation, and consequently imperfect; but they are never anything else than human hearts and brains. In other words, the two-chambered heart of the fœtus is not the heart of a fish because it is two-chambered; and the brain of a six months' fœtus is not the brain of a calf because it bears some resemblance to a ruminant's brain. However strongly the brain and intermaxillary bone of an eight-months' child may be "characteristic of the perfect ape," yet that child is not born an ape, neither does he grow up an ape. In our author's reasonings upon this point we have an example of a leading trait in his mental character, which has been exposed by his Edinburgh reviewer almost as strongly as in his own writings—a facility in perceiving *resemblances*, and an almost entire inability either to discover *differences*, or to comprehend them. This man would believe that snow and frozen carbonic acid are identical, because they have several similar properties; and when he has seen the evening clouds assuming shapes and hues as if

> "Built like a temple, where pilasters round
> Were set, and Doric pillars overlaid
> With golden architrave; nor did they want
> Cornice or frieze, with bossy sculptures graven;
> The roof was fretted gold;"

he has, doubtless, believed that a substantial stone-and-mortar temple was only an exhaled Pandemonium.

Again, it is admitted on all hands that a species, whether animal or vegetable, is capable of a certain degree of modification in accordance with external conditions. Hence, the varieties in the *Brassica oleracea*, as seen in the cauliflower and red cabbage; hence, the pointer, poodle, mastiff, grayhound, and other varieties among dogs; and hence, the Caucasian, Mongolian, American, and African races of the human species. It is nevertheless true that these deviations from standard types are confined within rigorous limits, which, though difficult to define, are never passed over. Not only is there no blending or intermingling of species, but the different varieties return to their original form, whenever the causes in which they originated cease to operate. When the cabbage and cauliflower are removed from the influence of cultivation, they manifest a tendency to return to the bitter sea-side plant. Dogs of different races have run wild in the West India Islands, and have all reverted to their original type, the shepherd's dog.* Mr. Lyell has also mentioned a still stronger case, indicating beyond dispute the reality and persistency of species. "Of the ox, undoubtedly, there are many very distinct races: but the bull Apis, which was led in solemn processions by the Egyptian priests, did not differ from some of those now living. The black cattle that have run wild in America, where there were many peculiarities in the climate not to be found, perhaps, in any part of the old world, and where scarcely a single plant on which they fed was of precisely the same species, instead of altering their form and habits, have actually reverted to the exact likeness of the aboriginal wild cattle of Europe."†

It is in the face of such facts as these, and a multitude more which might be adduced, that the author of the Vestiges builds up his air-castle of development by transmutation, and alledges that "species is a *term*, not a *fact*." Then, indeed, men may claim sonship to monkeys, and the apish propensity to "play fantastic tricks before high heaven," evinced by at least one individual of the human family, is satisfactorily accounted for.

But supposing the peculiar conditions favorable for an advance to a higher species, in what manner is the advance made? Nothing easier. "To protract the gestation over a small space is all that is necessary." True, he can only conjecture how this might be done; "but though this knowledge were never to be clearly attained, it need not much affect the present argument, provided it be satis-

* Lyell's Geology, vol. i, p. 501. † Principles of Geology, vol. i, p. 502.

factorily proved that there must be some such influence within the range of natural things." O no! this writer may go on piling assumption upon assumption, like Ossa upon Pelion; and if any one is so skeptical as to ask him for a particle or two of proof, he puts on an air of the most provoking *nonchalance*, and says:—Never mind about the proof; I will show you that this is within the range of possibilities: or, if it is not now possible, it might have been possible in the geological ages, when possibly the operation of these conditions was more powerful than at present! So, then, it would appear, that when the earth became too cold, and its vegetation too scanty for the shivering and starving mastodons, they were in circumstances so extremely favorable, that some lucky matron among them, by a slightly protracted gestation, produced a species a little higher in the stirps! But what proof has he that there is some such influence within the range of natural things? "Sex is fully ascertained to be a matter of development." To this the best anatomical authorities give a simple negative; and besides, everybody knows that gestation is not more protracted when a male is produced, than when a female is. But bees have the power of "adjusting the law of development to the production of a particular sex." In support of this assertion he cites the authority of Huber, whom he entirely misapprehends and misrepresents. So far from supposing that the sex of bees can be adjusted by the bees themselves, Huber not only supposed, but *proved*, that all the working bees, erroneously called neuters, are females.* But as only one prolific female can exist in a hive, the female larvæ are reared in such a manner that their organs of reproduction are not sufficiently developed to render them fruitful. As the Chinese inclose the feet of their female infants in wooden shoes, so that they never attain their mature size, nor become fitting instruments of locomotion, in like manner the bees, by rearing their female young in narrow cells and feeding them sparingly, prevent the natural development of their ovaries. But the larvæ contiguous to the royal cell do sometimes, by accident, obtain a share of the luxurious viands designed exclusively for her majesty's table, and become prolific workers. For this they pay the forfeit of their lives, being destroyed by the jealous and vindictive queen as soon as she is in a condition to attack them. Bees, therefore, will do nothing for our author, except to convict him of distorting facts and misquoting authorities.

There is one class of phenomena which this writer passes by in

* Nouvelles Observations sur les Abeilles.

discreet silence, but which presents a conclusive argument against his hypothesis of transmutation. It would seem that nature has set up impassable barriers to prevent confusion of species, and that she guards their outposts with the eye of a watchful sentinel. The penalty for overstepping her landmarks is death; for she has denounced the annihilating curse of sterility upon unlawful progeny, and never fails to execute her malediction. We refer to hybrids. The development system can give no rational explanation of the admitted natural repugnance to unions which produce such fruits, nor of the fact that the offspring of such unions are *almost always* unfruitful in the very first generation, and are *never* capable of continuing their race through several generations. We do no more than allude to this subject, the discussion of which would be more appropriate in a scientific treatise than in these pages. We refer the reader to Lyell's Geology, b. iii, for copious and valuable information upon this question, and upon the whole doctrine of transmutation. That learned and judicious writer is a firm believer "that species have a real existence in nature; and that each was endowed, at the time of its creation, with the attributes and organization by which it is now distinguished."* Owen, Agassiz, and Liebig, take the same ground. Cuvier "did not admit the analogy between the skeleton of the vertebrates and the skin of the articulates; he could not believe that the tænia and sepia were constructed upon the same plan; that there was a similarity of composition between the bird and the echinus, the whale and the snail, in spite of the skill with which some persons sought gradually to efface their discrepancies."† De La Beche thinks "there are likely to be few, seeing the beauty of design manifest in creation and so apparent in animals and vegetables, who will not rather consider that there has been a succession of creations as new conditions arose, than that there should be an accommodating property in organic existence which might ultimately convert a polypus into a man."‡ And Moses, whose authority our author is willing to admit, whenever, by any juggle of interpretation, the language of Moses can be made to coincide with his own views, informs us that "God made the beast of the earth *after his kind*, and cattle *after their kind*, and everything that creepeth upon the earth *after his kind*." Our author himself confesses that no instance of the development of any species into a higher has been recorded during the historical era; but this era is only a day in the cycle of nature's gestation;

* Principles of Geology, vol. i, p. 528. † Laurillard, Elog. de Cuvier, p. 66.
‡ Researches in Theoretical Geology, p. 203.

and as an ephemeron, having wearied himself by watching tadpoles through his day-long life, would die at evening in the full belief that a tadpole could never be transmuted into a frog, so our ephemeral human race live, observe, reason, and die. To all this there is but one answer. As to what occurred upon our globe during the pre-human epochs, we have no source of information but geological monuments; and in regard to this particular subject of transmutation, the old "Medals of Creation" are silent. On this point, therefore, our knowledge and his are equal, and the sum of both is zero. Pope's significant couplet may tell the rest:

> "Say first, of God above or man below
> What can we reason, but from what we know?"

We have now done with this anonymous writer, and his anomalous book. If we have been so fortunate as to convey to the reader our strong convictions, that not one of the three hypotheses, by which the scheme of law-creation is upheld, has any foundation in nature and truth, the object of our writing has been accomplished. We say nothing of the author's degrading psychology, which is phrenology pushed to its extreme development of materialism, and makes man a brute; nor of his selfish and sensual theory of morals, which, borrowed from Epicurus, annihilates all morality, makes virtue a name, and pleasure the *propter quam* of existence; nor of his stern and gloomy theology, which denies a special providence, and robs God of his highest attributes. All these are the legitimate offspring of his physical system. They grow out of it as naturally and necessarily as the vine from its roots, and grapes from the vine. "But the vine is the vine of Sodom; and the grapes are grapes of gall." Away with the miserable logic that could frame such a system, and the pitiful credulity that could embrace it. Leave us still, in these scenes of toil and trial, which are incident to our earthly condition, not the cold assurance that we are under "a system which has the fairness of a lottery," that "there is no partiality against us," and that we must "take our chance in the mêlée;" but the power to look upward and to recognize the countenance of a Creator and a Father.

Dickinson College, Jan. 31, 1846.

Art. VIII.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *The Preacher's Manual: Lectures on Preaching, furnishing Rules and Examples for every Kind of Pulpit Address.* By Rev. S. T. Sturtevant. Reprinted entire from the last London revised Edition. 8vo., pp. 624. New-York: J. C. Riker, 129 Fulton-street. 1846.

Several works upon the composition and delivery of a sermon have long been before the public, and have undoubtedly exerted a salutary influence upon the pulpit. The earliest, and the one which has been most approved, is that of M. Claude, a famous French Protestant, who flourished the latter part of the seventeenth century. Upon Claude's Essay little improvement has been made until the present work appeared. Here we have the whole theory of sermonizing, drawn out in all its parts, with appropriate illustrations, taken from the best authors. Indeed, this work seems to leave little to be desired touching the vastly important subject of sermonizing, so far as mere canons for the structure of a sermon can go. We hesitate not to say, that the minister of the gospel, old or young, who fails to procure and study "Sturtevant's Manual," will deprive himself of one of the best human helps which is to be obtained, in the great work in which he is engaged. The work, as to type, paper, &c., is highly creditable to the enterprising publisher, and we have no doubt that he will be amply rewarded for furnishing the ministers of the gospel in this country with this learned and able work in so convenient a form. In their behalf, we cordially thank our worthy friend Riker for the timely and liberal outlay which he has made for their accommodation. And I need not pledge them for a liberal patronage, so long as all know that they always buy the books they need, when the price comes within the reach of their means.

---

2. *History of the English Revolution of* 1640; *commonly called the Great Rebellion: from the Accession of Charles I. to his Death.* By F. Guizot, the Prime Minister of France. Translated by William Hazlitt. 12mo., pp. 515. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1846.

The historical works of "the prime minister of France" are so well known, that little need be said to invite public attention to any work which might issue from the press, under the sanction of his name. But the history of such a period—of such events as those embraced within the range of "The Great Rebellion"—by such a writer, must excite no ordinary interest in the public mind. From the cursory examination which we have given the book, we feel warranted in giving our readers a pledge, that all reasonable expectations will be realized in the perusal. It is truly consoling to a liberal mind to see that the prejudiced and dreamy commentaries of a class of the English historians, upon this very important period of their history —such, for instance, as those who have followed the refined but reckless and skeptical Hume—have lost their influence, and are rapidly going to oblivion. We will merely add that the work appears in a neat and an attractive form.

3. *The History of Silk, Cotton, Linen, Wool, and other Fibrous Substances: including Observations on Spinning, Dyeing, and Weaving; also an Account of the Pastoral Life of the Ancients, their Social State and Attainments in the Domestic Arts. With Appendices on Pliny's Natural History, etc., deduced from Copious and Authentic Sources.* Illustrated by steel engravings. One volume, octavo. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

This work will be esteemed of peculiar value from the prodigious amount of curious, original, and striking information it affords respecting the early history and progress of the above-named useful and important arts. We scarcely remember to have met with a single volume more copious in anecdotical illustration than this: the numerous authorities cited by the author bear ample testimony to the indefatigable labor and research bestowed upon the work. Although primarily designed for popular use, this valuable work must prove eminently serviceable to those engaged in the cultivation of silk, cotton, linen, wool, &c., from the vast extent of its information on these important branches of commerce. The work is splendidly embellished with steel engravings; and bound in truly elegant style, richly gilt. It is quite a book for the boudoir.

---

4. *Cosmos: a Survey of the General Physical History of the Universe.* By Alex. Von Humboldt. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

The Harpers are issuing in numbers this great work of the veteran and distinguished geographer Humboldt. It embraces a very wide range of scientific inquiry, as its title sufficiently indicates; and sets forth the final conclusions of a long life of arduous and well-directed study. It is not to be supposed that all will agree to the justice of these conclusions; but no scientific mind can fail to be interested in the book which contains them. The work is published in shilling numbers.

---

5. *Vital Christianity: Essays and Discourses on the Religion of Man and the Religion of God.* By Alexander Venet, D. D., Professor of Theology in Lausanne, Switzerland. Translated, with an Introduction, by Robert Turnbull, Pastor of the Harvard-street Church, Boston. 12mo., pp. 355. Boston: Gould, Kendall, & Lincoln. 1845.

The new evangelical school of divines, which have recently arisen and are now acting effectively upon the dead mass of degenerate Christians in Switzerland, are also giving instructions to the churches throughout the world. The present volume is a spirited and powerful effort to exhibit true Christianity in its purity and spirituality. The work can scarcely be read without profit, though occasionally we may find it necessary to except to the author's views. Upon the whole it is an able, earnest, truthful book.

6. *The Life of Julius Cæsar.* George Peck, Editor. 18mo., pp. 180. New-York: Lane & Tippett.

This is the first of a series of small volumes publishing by the Religious Tract Society of England. They are upon "common subjects written with a decidedly Christian tone." Each volume will be complete in itself, will compare with the above in size and character, and will be issued *monthly*. The Agents design to bring them out promptly on their being received, and there is no doubt but they will constitute a portable library of general knowledge superior to anything of the kind heretofore published. "The Life of Julius Cæsar" is composed from the original Latin works, and while it is condensed into a small space, it is still exceedingly comprehensive, and conveys all the important facts in the history of one of the greatest military chieftains and conquerors who ever lived. The volumes will be sold separately or in *libraries*, in uniform binding, and numbered. We earnestly bespeak the attention of the young to this new series.

---

7. *Resources and Duties of Christian Young Men. A Discourse to the Graduating Class of Wesleyan University, August*, 1845. By Stephen Olin, D. D. George Peck, Editor. 18mo. New-York: Lane & Tippett. 1846.

This is an able, spirited, and timely effort to make a truly Christian impression, and give a Christian bias to our "young men," just as they are entering upon the active duties of life. We scarcely know whether to admire most the sound reasoning, the wise counsel, or the earnest and solemn warnings of this eloquent and powerful discourse. We have not space to enlarge upon its merits; but sure we are that it should be read and studied by every young man in the land, especially those who emerge from our literary institutions and look toward a field of action. The discourse is neatly got up in a portable form, and is thus rendered more convenient and attractive than it would be in the usual pamphlet form. We earnestly recommend this effort of our truly able and excellent friend to the attention of *all*:—for though it is especially addressed to "Christian young men," there are instructions in it adapted to all classes and to both sexes. May God grant it his blessing!

---

8. *History of the Great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, in Germany, Switzerland, &c.* By J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D. D., President of the Theological School of Geneva, and Member of the Societé Evangelique. New-York: Lane & Tippett.

We are happy to announce this work with the imprint of the Methodist Book Concern. Of the work itself nothing need be said, as happily it is already known.

---

9. *Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petræa, and the Holy Land.* By Rev. Stephen Olin, D. D., LL. D., President of the Wesleyan University. With twelve Illustrations on Steel. 2 vols. New-York: Lane & Tippett.

These interesting Travels are now to be had at our Book Room, with our Sunday-school imprint, at reduced prices. We hope no Sunday-school library, or family, will be without them.

---

10. *Suggestions for the Conversion of the World, respectfully submitted to the Christian Church.* By Robert Young. 18mo., pp. 146. New-York: Lane & Tippett.

The solemn and momentous inquiry, *How is the world to be converted?* is one which comes home to every pious heart. Here the question is answered upon the principles of true Christian philosophy. Let the book be read, and its "suggestions" tested by experiment, and we shall soon see more abundant reason than ever to expect the *speedy* "conversion of the world."

11. *Short Sermons on Important Subjects.* By JONATHAN EDMONDSON, A. M. With an Introduction by Rev. J. P. DURBIN, D. D., late President of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. First American from the fifth London Edition. 8vo., pp. 535. Phila.: Sorin & Ball. 1846.

THE author of these sermons is a Wesleyan Methodist preacher, who has written several works of great worth, for their sound orthodoxy and excellent practical tendency. The present volume is made up of sermons suited to the use of families and private individuals. They have the great merit of conveying much useful instruction within a narrow compass. The sermons generally occupy scarcely three pages each, and may be read in a few minutes. The style is plain, perspicuous, forcible, and elegant. The work cannot fail to have an extensive circulation, and to do much good. The mechanical execution is highly creditable to the enterprising publishers.

---

12. *The Attraction of the Cross; designed to illustrate the leading Truths, Obligations, and Hopes of Christianity.* By GARDINER SPRING, D. D., Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the City of New-York. 12mo., pp. 413. New-York: M. W. Dodd. 1846.

WE cannot be expected to agree with all there is in this book; yet the points in which we do most cordially coincide with the learned and pious author are so much more numerous and of so much greater importance, than those upon which we differ with him, that we shall institute no controversy with him. Dr. Spring is a moderate Calvinist—thoroughly evangelical, and eminently practical. The present work fully sustains his high character as a divine and as a scholar.

---

13. *Morse's Cerographic Maps, Nos. 1 to 4.* New-York: Harper & Brothers.

THESE very beautiful Maps, executed in colors, form the commencement of a series which, when completed, will constitute the most elegant, competent, and the cheapest atlas yet produced. Each number (price 25 cents) contains four maps, of the size of 15 by 12 inches; these Maps, embracing the whole field of ancient and modern, including sacred, geography, have been prepared with great labor and expense, and in many instances founded on new and important data. As a popular atlas for colleges, schools, and private use, we have seen no work possessing so many, and valuable, advantages; it is deserving of the widest patronage.

---

14. *The Pilgrim's Progress; with a Life of John Bunyan.* By ROBERT SOUTHEY, LL. D. Illustrated with fifty cuts by Adams. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

THIS is a new and very attractive edition of the world-renowned and matchless allegory of Bunyan: the embellishments are well designed, and engraved on wood by Adams; and, as far as we have examined, admirable illustrations of the text. The Memoir of the illustrious author, by Southey, although a very elegant and poetical, is far from being a true and faithful, portraiture of Bunyan. Dr. Southey's Life will, however, be perused by many with high satisfaction. This very neat and compact edition is so beautiful in its interior and exterior, that few works would be more suitable for a Christian present to the young.

---

15. *Aids to English Composition; prepared for Students of all Grades, embracing Specimens and Examples of School and College Exercises, and most of the high Departments of English Composition, both in Prose and Verse.* By R. G. PARKER. A new Edition, with Additions and Improvements. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

THE previous edition of this very useful book gained for its author a decided reputation: the improvements introduced both as to materials and illustrations, as well as plan and arrangement, will be found greatly to increase its value. The scope of the work is wide, and comprehensive; it combines a vast amount of instructive matter, and cannot fail of proving very beneficial to those who, with or without the adjunct of a tutor, are pursuing the subject of which it treats: indeed, all who value and aim to acquire the use of elegant diction will find the work a desideratum.

16. *Sermons by Rev. Hugh Blair, D. D.* New-York: Harper & Brothers.

Every English reader knows well this distinguished writer on the Belles Lettres and Rhetoric. A volume of ethical and religious discourses from such a pen cannot fail of being generally acceptable. The present edition is handsomely produced by the Messrs. Harper in octavo, and on good paper, so that old as well as young eyes may enjoy the rich treat of perusing these admirable, and truly splendid productions. The topics comprise the whole range of moral and religious teaching: no better book, perhaps, could be placed in the library of the youthful or aged; it will prove equally instructive to both classes.

---

17. *Journal of the Texian Expedition against Meir: including the subsequent Imprisonment of the Author, his Sufferings, and ultimate Escape from the Castle of Perote: together with his Reflections on the political Prospects, and probable future Relations, of Texas, Mexico, and the United States.* By General Thomas J. Green. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

This is a personal narrative of deep, absorbing interest, delineating the numerous perils, sufferings, and hazardous exploits of a small but heroic band of Texians in the cause of liberty. There are scenes of an intense and vivid description in this work, which are scarcely to be equaled by works of fiction. The cruelties and perfidious duplicity of Santa Anna are laid bare with no sparing hand: and the author has contributed, also, by his dark pictures, to add no small share of ignominy to his name, by his personal revelations. There is much local and statistical information obtainable from this work about a country little known.

---

18. *Miscellaneous Essays.* By John Abercrombie. New-York: Harper & Brothers.

The well-earned reputation of this excellent writer in the department of moral philosophy cannot fail of insuring the attention of all thinking readers. The present volume is a posthumous collection of essays on theoretical and practical morals and religion. The doctor is orthodox and sound, and as to his style and mental strength, let his admired works on the "Intellectual Powers," and the "Moral Feelings," bear testimony.

---

19. *The Extent of the Atonement in its Relation to God and the Universe.* By Thomas W. Jenkyn, D. D., President of Coward College, London. Second American from the third London Edition. 12mo., pp. 266. Boston: Gould, Kendall & Lincoln. Sold by J. W. Colby, 122 Nassau-st., New-York. 1846.

20. *The Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church in the Communion of the World.* By Thomas W. Jenkyn, D. D., &c. 12mo., pp. 304. Sold as above. 1846.

These books are learned, evangelical, and full of instruction—the first is moderately Calvinistic.

21. *Critical Exposition of Baptism; embracing the Mosaic Baptisms, Jewish Traditionary Baptisms, John's Baptism, and Christian Baptism: clearly establishing the Scriptural Authority of Affusion and Sprinkling, and of Infant Baptism.* By Leicester A. Sawyer, A. M., President of Central College, Ohio. Cincinnati: H. W. Derby & Co. New-York: Appletons.

22. *Elements of Moral Philosophy, on the Basis of the Ten Commandments; containing a Complete System of Moral Duties.* By Leicester A. Sawyer, A. M., &c. 12mo., pp. 335. New-York: Mark Newman. 1845.

23. *Catechism of Christian Morals; and also of Christian Doctrines: together with Devotional Exercises and Hymns: adapted to the Use of Families and Sabbath Schools.* By Leicester A. Sawyer, A. M., &c. 18mo., pp. 72. New-York: Payne & Burgess, 60 John-street.

The author entertains some peculiar views of the nature of virtue, which we have not space even to state.